REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 417 24

THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COURSES IN THE
HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.
BY- MAIER, PAUL L. AND OTHERS
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIV., KALAMAZOO
REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-052 PUB DATE 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.28 182P.

DESCRIPTORS- *WORLD HISTORY, *HISTORY INSTRUCTION, *INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT, COURSE ORGANIZATION, *DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS, *CONFERENCES, QUESTIONNAIRES, KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN

A DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE, CONSISTING OF LEADING AUTHORITIES IN HISTORY AND RELATED DISCIPLINES, WAS HELD IN JUNE 1964. THE SUGGESTIONS AND DIRECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCE WERE IMPLEMENTED. PRELIMINARY SAMPLING VISITS WERE MADE AT REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS, AND MATERIALS AND INSTRUMENTS FOR THE MAJOR INVESTIGATION PREPARED. RESEARCH PROCEDURES INCLUDED THE DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRES, INTERVIEWS WITH REPRESENTATIVES FROM INSTITUTIONS, DATA COLLECTION, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, PREPARATION OF MODELS, AND DISSEMINATION OF THE RESULTS. THE CONCLUSIONS REACHED WERE MANY AND VARIED. IN GENERAL, THERE WAS SUPPORT FOR THE BASIC CAUSE, CONCERN OVER TEACHING METHODS, AND THE BELIEF THAT HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION WAS NOT ADEQUATE. THE PROJECT RECEIVED GENERAL SUPPORT FROM MOST OF THE INSTRUCTORS INTERVIEWED. (RS)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COURSES IN THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION

-- DEVELOPMENTAL PHASE --

Cooperative Research Project No. F-052

* * *

Paul L. Maier, Chief Investigator

Coinvestigators:

Dale P. Pattison
Willis F. Dunbar
Robert J. Hahn
Gilbert W. Morell
Charles R. Starring

Department of History
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

1965

* * *

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

ED 003417

CONTENTS

I. Problem and Background 1

II. Objectives 2

III. Related Research 3

IV. Procedure 4

V. Findings and Results 6

  Summary of the Developmental Conference 6

  Conference Implementation 16

    Preliminary Interviews 16
    Research Instruments 18
    Criteria to be Used in Selecting Institutions for Intensive Study 20
    Procedural Guidelines for a National Course Improvement Project 24

VI. Conclusions and Implications 25

Bibliography 28

Appendix A: Developmental Conference Transcript 33

Appendix B: Proposed Research Instruments 149

  Questionnaire HCP 1 150
  Questionnaire HCP 2 156
  Questionnaire HCP 3 161
  Questionnaire HCP 4 166
  Questionnaire HCP 5 169
  Questionnaire HCP 6 171
  Questionnaire HCP 7 173
  Questionnaire HCP 8 175
  Questionnaire HCP 9 177

I. PROBLEM AND BACKGROUND

Introductory survey courses in the history of civilization are now offered in a large majority of American colleges and universities. Usually placed in the freshman or sophomore curriculum, such courses are variously entitled "World Civilizations," "Western Civilization," "Foundations of Culture," "History of Civilization," "World History," "History 100-101," and the like. In this project, the term "history of civilization" is used to denote all courses of this kind, whether or not their scope is limited to the Western world.

The high incidence of history of civilization offerings reflects their great value in presenting to students a broad spectrum of man's cultural background and in showing them how present institutions in government, society, and intellect developed from the past. History of civilization courses also introduce students to fields they may elect for further study and specialization within or outside the discipline of history. Even if this may be the only history course a student chooses during his college career, it provides him some understanding of time and change for the 5,000 years of civilized history, as well as a liaison with many other disciplines in the liberal arts and sciences.

While usually staffed by members of the history faculty, these courses are sometimes administered as required subjects under departments of "General Education" or "Basic Studies." Accordingly, they vary widely from institution to institution.

Despite the recognized merits of these general survey courses and their high incidence, considerable criticism of their structure, content, and pedagogy has arisen from both faculty and students. More than their "pure history" counterparts, these courses necessarily involve much material from such related disciplines as political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, art, literature, philosophy, and religion -- areas of competence often beyond that of the average, perhaps overspecialized, history instructor. Communicating this breadth of material to the student in a relevant and interest-sustaining manner is an additional problem, which many instructors have failed to solve for several reasons: faulty course structure or content, inadequate subject preparation for the special requirements of these courses, unsatisfactory methods of instruction, and low morale as a consequence of demeaning departmental attitudes.

A majority of 280 history department heads, responding to a questionnaire sent out by the Department of History at Western Michigan University in June, 1963, registered dissatisfaction with their survey courses. Yet any concern to improve these offerings was sometimes modified by the attitude expressed by one department head: "Teaching in these classes is generally regarded as a sort of purgatory which all new instructors must endure before showing themselves worthy of teaching advanced courses."

Because history of civilization courses present material indispensable to a liberal education, and since students' attitudes toward the social sciences, especially history, can be adversely affected by survey courses poorly conceived or taught, the Department of History at Western Michigan University has undertaken a research project to discover how courses in the history of civilization can be improved in content and instruction. The developmental activities of this investigation were supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This research project was structured in two phases: (1) a developmental segment, which prepared guidelines and research instruments for (2) the major investigation itself. This final report refers only to the first or developmental phase.

II. OBJECTIVES

The preparatory stage of this project sought answers to the following questions, which were to be explored at a conference of leading authorities in history and related fields:

1. What are the chief values in history of civilization courses? From the broad cavalcade of history, what can and should be covered in an ideal history of civilization course? To what extent should the non-Western world be involved?

2. Where are the chief deficiencies in present college and university civilization courses, in structure, scope, content, textbooks, materials, departmental attitudes, or pedagogy?

3. How can these deficiencies be remedied? Here, specific suggestions for the improvement of such courses were to be solicited. Is special preparation desirable for instructors in these classes, perhaps at the terminal-degree level?

Since one conference could not hope to provide all answers to these questions, the consultants were to discuss also the following items:

4. How can an investigation to improve history of civilization offerings best be conducted? Is a national research project desirable? If so, what should be its guidelines and procedures, its length and scope? Here the objectives, methods, and techniques for accumulating and analyzing data were to be determined:

    a. Regarding the use of research instruments, what should a questionnaire contain and to whom should it be sent?

    b. If personal interviews at representative campuses are indicated, what criteria should determine the institutions and departments to be visited? What colleges offer unusually successful civilization courses?

c. To what extent should student and alumni opinion be canvassed?

d. What other research methods should be employed?

5. How should the findings of this investigation be analyzed, disseminated, and used for improving the quality of the civilization course?

Following this conference, the project committee was to implement the suggestions and directives of the consultants. Various research instruments proposed at the conference were to be prepared and sampling visitations at a few representative colleges and universities undertaken in order to assist in the formulation of questionnaires and personal visitation techniques. These instruments, as well as an edited transcript of the conference -- materials prerequisite for the major investigation -- were to be forwarded to the Office of Education at the close of the developmental phase of the project.

III. RELATED RESEARCH

So far as could be determined, no extensive study of American collegiate history of civilization courses has ever been undertaken. There is abundant reference to such courses, however, in the literature of the social sciences, education, and especially history. A more complete listing of appropriate books and articles is provided in the Bibliography.

According to Perkins and Snell, nearly 70 percent of 502 American colleges in their sampling offered history of civilization courses between 1956 and 1958 (Dexter Perkins and John Snell, The Education of Historians in the United States, McGraw-Hill, 1962, p.76). The specific regional breakdown was as follows: 68 percent of colleges in the East offered the course; 68 percent in the South; 67 percent in the Midwest; and 77 percent in the West. In a similar sampling by types of 376 institutions, the same investigators reported the following incidence: 75 percent of professional colleges, 55 percent of teachers' colleges, 67 percent of colleges for Negroes, 79 percent of Roman Catholic colleges, and 68 percent of general colleges offered a civilization course (op. cit., p. 77).

These investigators frequently encountered the complaint of overspecialized training of history instructors, a flaw which becomes especially apparent in civilization courses, which, by their very nature, demand breadth. The problem of overspecialization has also been cited by Jacques Barzun in The House of Intellect (Harper, 1959, p. 118), in which he condemned "a 'philosophy' which says that the college student should receive a general and liberal education, and which makes its teachers a living refutation of that ideal."

"A course in the history of civilization," according to Bernard Wishy, "requires a background that few men have....Young teachers, unsympathetic to general education, have occasionally been used to fulfill the department's budgetary commitment to present or staff such courses. Some of these had a sense that their subject was superficial or unscholarly, and their teaching ineffective. Seeing their poor performance reflected in the work of their students, the apathetic instructors blamed their failure on intrinsic weaknesses in the courses, and hostility toward them manifested itself in a vicious circle." (Bernard Wishy, "General Education in Extremis," The Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (May, 1963), 270-77).

The need for improving civilization courses was further demonstrated by the returns from a brief, preliminary investigation of such courses, which was undertaken by the Department of History at Western Michigan University. In June, 1963, a one-page questionnaire was sent to the heads of history departments at 937 universities, colleges, and two-year junior colleges throughout the United States. Since these were merely form letters without follow-up correspondence, intended only to secure a brief preliminary sampling, no great return was anticipated. Nevertheless, 280 replies were received and tabulated. This response warrants the following conclusions:

1. A history of civilization course was offered in nearly every institution replying to the questionnaire. The course was predominantly a three-hour, two-semester offering. Only 10 of 280 replies indicated that such a course was not offered, and these were small schools of limited facilities.

2. Members of the history faculty usually staffed such courses.

3. Substantial dissatisfaction was expressed with the way in which the course was structured and taught.

4. Many respondents deemed a program of special preparation for instructors in these courses advisable. Of 280 replies, 48 indicated that such a program was not needed. An additional 54 gave only qualified approval, while 178 indicated that a program of this nature would be desirable, and should include broader acquaintance with the history-related disciplines, as well as training in specialized teaching methods.

In summary, the related research appeared to justify an investigation concerned with the improvement of history of civilization courses.

IV. PROCEDURE

Although preliminary activities for this project began in June, 1963, the developmental activities program which was supported by the Office of Education extended officially from June 15, 1964 until November 14, 1964. The procedure involved in this research comprised the following phases.

A. Conference Preparation

A project committee was appointed from the history faculty at Western Michigan University, composed of the following members: Paul L. Maier, Associate Professor of History -- Project Director; Dale P. Pattison, Assistant Professor of History -- Assistant Director; Willis F. Dunbar, Head, Department of History; Robert J. Hahn, Assistant Professor of History; and Charles R. Starring, Professor of History and Chairman, World Civilizations courses -- staff members. Prof. Gilbert W. Morell served as research associate. Staff liaison at the U.S. Office of Education was provided by Dr. William Wolf, Director of the Curriculum Improvement Program.

The project committee was advised by representatives from the political science, economics, art, philosophy, and education faculties at Western Michigan University, since civilization courses are somewhat interdepartmental in scope and content, and are sometimes administered by other than history departments. The School of Education made particularly valuable suggestions regarding specialists in the field of pedagogy.

A developmental conference of leading authorities in history and related disciplines was thought best suited to the purposes of this project, and letters of invitation to such a conference were sent to some of the most highly qualified consultants in fields germane to the investigation. Nearly all of those invited accepted.

B. The Conference

The developmental conference took place from June 15 through 17, 1964, at Western Michigan University. Areas of competence represented at the conclave and the participants were as follows. (For a more complete listing of the consultants' positions and writings, see Appendix A, pp. 4-5.)

Authorities in the Study and Teaching of History: Prof. Dexter Perkins, University of Rochester; Prof. John L. Snell, Tulane University

Authors of Textbooks in the History of Civilization: Prof. Geoffrey Bruun, University of Illinois; Prof. Goldwin Smith, Wayne State University; Prof. Joseph R. Strayer, Princeton University; Prof. Richard E. Sullivan, Michigan State University; Prof. T. Walter Wallbank, University of Southern California

History Department Heads: Prof. Eric W. Cochrane, University of Chicago; Prof. Willis F. Dunbar, Western Michigan University; Prof. Alfred H. Kelly, Wayne State University

Authorities in Pedagogy: Dean Robert J. Schaefer, Columbia Teachers College; Dr. Robert F. Sullivan, North Central Association

Specialist in the non-Western World: Prof. Claude A. Buss, Stanford University

Consultant on the British Practices in Civilization Courses: Prof. Alastair M. Taylor, Queen's University (Canada)

Representative of Junior Colleges: Dr. Roger H. Van Bolt, Flint Junior College

Authority in General Education: Prof. Russell B. Thomas, University of Chicago

Additional participants included the project committee and representatives from other disciplines at Western Michigan University. Members of the Department of History also observed the proceedings.

A transcript of the conference discussions was subsequently sent to the panelists for editorial correction. This transcript, further edited and slightly abridged by the project director, constitutes Appendix A of this report.

C. Conference Implementation

In the months following the conference, the project committee carried out the suggestions and directives of the consultants. Important authorities who could not attend the conclave were contacted, and investigation of the problem continued.

History and basic studies departments at 17 representative colleges and universities were visited by the director and assistant director of the project in a preliminary survey to determine the status of their civilization courses -- the difficulties and/or satisfactions encountered -- and their reactions to a contemplated national research project to improve such offerings. These visits provided important additional items for inclusion in the research instruments.

After these visitations and an extended study of the conference transcript, the project committee prepared nine research questionnaires, established criteria for investigating representative colleges and universities, assembled a history of civilization bibliography, and drew up plans for the major phase of this project. Several of the basic questionnaires were submitted to the conference consultants for criticism, and their suggestions have been incorporated in the questionnaire series presented in Appendix B.

V. FINDINGS AND RESULTS

A. Summary of the Developmental Conference, June 15-17, 1964

While a complete, edited transcript of the entire conference is provided as Appendix A, an epitome of the sessions may be appropriate here.

After opening greetings from President James W. Miller and Vice-

President Russell H. Seibert of Western Michigan University, the Head of the History Department, Dr. Willis F. Dunbar, and Project Director Paul L. Maier explained the background of the project and the objectives of the conference.

In a paper on "The History of History of Civilization Courses," Prof. Dexter Perkins pointed to three values of such courses: a sense of process and change, a sense of beauty, and a sense of the role of science. While these courses have great utility, he observed, they can also become routine, and therefore the conference served a good purpose in reviewing and revitalizing such offerings. A general course liberates the mind of the instructor and also requires a process of selection or organization which better prepares him for the exposition of his specialized field. Prof. Perkins emphasized that more concern must be shown in graduate schools for training future professors. Graduate assistants should not be left "rudderless"; they require guidance in their first teaching experiences. Colleges and universities should demand some proof of teaching ability before hiring a candidate. He suggested that the civilization course was not well suited to the segmented or team-teaching approach, since specialized points of view would impair a course which has a "unity all its own." Finally, he believed the course should have a Western emphasis.

In discussing "Values of the Course--Real or Imaginary?" Prof. Geoffrey Bruun spoke of a threefold value of the civilization course. The first is a sense of time, a "time-bridge" with which to put 5,000 years of history into proper perspective. The learning process is not simply a matter of assimilating facts; it must so organize these facts in the mind as to make them retrievable when necessary. Secondly, the course has liaison value with the student's other subjects. Present university curriculums have "too many bricks and too little mortar"; this course offers the mortar, the cohesion necessary to integrate knowledge. More of science and technology might be included in the course, for it provides the best meeting ground for C. P. Snow's "two cultures." Third, the course can de-parochialize the student by including more materials from the non-Western world.

During the ensuing discussion, Prof. Bruun's observation that present civilization courses sometimes suffered from hazy goals, aims, and purposes was followed by Prof. Wallbank's suggestion that generalists in these courses need not be so defensive about criticism from specialists, who move "so meticulously and picayunishly through the maze of historical minutiae." Prof. Strayer thought no instructor should teach the course less than five years nor more than ten. Since the teacher gains much from the broad survey course, he should share it with others and return to it after an interim. Prof. Strayer also recommended that graduate assistants not simply be "turned loose on undergraduates," but should be guided and criticized as they discover that teaching is the raison d'etre of the profession.

Prof. Richard Sullivan cautioned against the stultifying effects of insisting on specific aims for the course. Prof. Bruun concurred, suggesting that the initiative of instructors should be encouraged, not curbed.

Prof. Cochrane admitted that though his specialty is the Italian Renaissance, he derived great benefit from reading and teaching in the general history survey course. He also cautioned against using graduate assistants as instructors, for though the assistants may be gaining valuable training, the rights of the undergraduate, who has often made considerable sacrifice to secure the best instruction the institution can offer, are thereby ignored. The problem of training graduate students for teaching is a grave one, he commented.

Prof. Kelly observed that the medical profession provides an analogue with its internship program. The experience of teaching as a graduate assistant is essential, but so too is proper supervision of that teaching. He recommended that new teachers in the course meet frequently with experienced faculty in a "civilization seminar"to discuss the special problems of the course and compare experiences.

* * *

In his paper on "The 'Ideal' History of Civilization Course," Prof. Wallbank cited both the urgent present need for these courses and the difficulties which attend them. The chief problem is that of the tremendous mass of material to be covered. What should be selected, what omitted? Shall the course run one, two, or three semesters, or more? Shall it be "Western" or "world" in emphasis? He felt that too much is done with too little in the Western-oriented course, and too little done with too much in the world history approach. He recommended the following course: (1) one which uses the cultural approach as the basis of organization, with economic, social, ideational, and artistic elements woven into the framework of political history, for politics provides "the necessary pegs on which we can hang our data." (2) the non-Western areas must be included. The Western limitation has robbed many people in underdeveloped areas of their own heritage, e.g., Africans reading Whittier or Sir Walter Scott, knowing all about the Wars of the Roses but nothing about their own national literature and history. (3) The last century should receive greater emphasis for its immediate relevance to the student. Prof. Wallbank then gave examples of how some segments of ancient and medieval history might be compressed.

Prof. Cochrane expressed "utter horror" at the abolition of centuries of civilization for the sake of logical categories. Prof. Bruun remarked that with no drastic revision, the textbook which he and Prof. Ferguson authored thirty years ago to meet the demands of that time is still used in many colleges today. But the purely Western emphasis is a "straitjacket" which must be shed today, and a truly world history approach must be sought. Prof. Perkins cautioned against too heavy an emphasis on non-Western areas, for the student should seek to understand first the society in which he lives -- a large order in itself. But he must not be too narrow about it.

Prof. Thomas suggested that the conference might assume too much in thinking that a civilization offering may be the only history course many students are taking and that instructors are obligated, accordingly, to achieve a complete accounting of the cultural past. Other courses in the humanities also contribute to the student's understanding of history, even if they may not be under the direction of the history department.

In an exchange of views, Profs. Cochrane, Wallbank, and Kelly discussed whether the past should be considered as a subject of study valid in itself, or as introductory to the present. History teachers constantly have to struggle in overcoming the students' notion of the discontinuity of history. Prof. Taylor wondered if the dichotomy, history as past or history as prologue, need exist. Both approaches can be combined in a higher synthesis, history as past and prologue, casual and causal. He also suggested that technology might be an appropriate bridge between different civilizations, with attention given to the question of how communication failure between the humanistic and technological value systems developed.

Discussing the problem of scope -- what can and should be covered in the history of man -- Prof. Strayer stated that learning is a cumulative process, and that if a satisfactory world history course were taught on the high-school level, the college course could be much improved. He estimated that only about half of the students take a world history course in high school -- usually the half which is not going on to college. The freshman history survey course is valuable, he said, because it teaches what human behavior is like, and it does so in an interesting manner. There are two axes involved in studying human behavior. Through a horizontal axis, a given society during a certain period is explored from three points of view: its organization, specialization, and the system of beliefs which underpins and modifies the other two. The other axis is vertical, a time axis which is absolutely essential in discovering development, process, and change. The Western experience in civilization should be emphasized because of the availability of materials and the fact that the West is having the greatest impact on the rest of the world today. But even in a Western civilization course, he suggested, the scope should be reduced so as to start with approximately the twelfth century, explaining (as a confessed Medievalist) that it was during the Middle Ages that the characteristic European institutions took shape. The ancient world might be covered through a flashback procedure. So far as the non-Western world is concerned, two years would be required, ideally, for a comprehensive civilization course. Since so much time is rarely granted, continuing education may have to finish the job. One short course cannot tell the complete story.

Also addressing himself to the problem of scope, Prof. Smith stressed that the ideal course should emphasize those developments most relevant to the twentieth century, and should therefore be planned with cumulative chronological emphasis. Only those ideas, events, and institutions from the past should be stressed which provide roots for contemporary society. More attention should be given to science, mathematics, technology, and social and economic history, less to the humanities. Too much class time has been spent on theological and political controversies of the past which have little significance for the present.

Prof. Thomas related -- and concurred with -- a comment made by Ferdinand Schevill twenty years ago that "history today is global. It will be impossible to write a history of Western Europe any more that will not take into account the rest of this planet." Prof. Thomas criticized one-year civilization courses for reducing action and intellectual achievement to a common denominator for a given era, usually called by such descriptive labels as "The Enlightenment," "The Romantic Era," and the like, which provides a distorted and specious division of history into temporal blocks. The danger is that only those works and events which justify the descriptive labels are selected and presented. He further stated that history, in the broadest sense, is not the exclusive property of the history departments. Now that literature, art, philosophy, language, and science are treated in their historical contexts, more effective correlation must be made of these sources of instruction.

Drawing the discussion on scope to a close, Prof. Maier (as a confessed classicist) challenged the dictum that "relevance is proportional to modernity," and objected to placing even more emphasis on modern history at the expense of the ancient and medieval worlds. Depending on how the material is presented, students follow the strategy of Hannibal vs. the Romans with at least the same enthusiasm as events in the World Wars. As to increasing the already lopsided emphasis on recent history, he recalled that most two-volume civilization texts have their breaking point at 1648 or even 1714 A.D., covering 6,600 years of history in the first volume, and a scant 300 in the second, a ratio of 22 to 1 in terms of chronological coverage. Accordingly, he argued against further compression of the ancient and medieval segments.

The discussion then turned toward improving world history courses in secondary schools. As chairman of the Committee on Teaching of the American Historical Association, Prof. Strayer was especially concerned with this area which, he said, was beset with serious problems. The world history course is typically given too early in the high-school curriculum, because state laws often require American history or government courses during the final years. History requires considerable reading, which often exceeds the competence of ninth and tenth graders. He estimated that probably only one-third of college-bound students enroll in high-school world history courses.

Dr. Van Bolt later commented that the physical sciences have gone into the secondary field and provided new materials and structure in order to equip their students with a desirable secondary background. Perhaps historians might do the same, and thus ease many of their problems at the collegiate level.

Returning to the question of designing an ideal survey course, Prof. Taylor suggested that universities might offer two different but equally valid courses. One, "past as prologue," would treat history as a social science or behavioral discipline, while the other, "past as past," would stress the uniqueness and humanistic values of the subject. The conference might well consider this factor of focus and possible demarcation.

Prof. Buss then discussed "Involvement of the non-Western World." A Western civilization course is substantially different from its world history counterpart. It is more than a question of scope: the entire approach should be different. Objecting to the terms "East" and "West" as imprecise and the term "non-West" as negative in connotation, he warned that the East should not be taught as a variant of the West, for the seeds of current political conflict between the two worlds lie deep in cultural differences. Western concepts like progress, democracy, and freedom are quite alien to the East; social and economic institutions are also dissimilar. If the introductory college course is devoted to Western civilization, some later provision must also be made for the East. A coincidence of independent responses in East and West to similar challenges may lead to the conclusion that there are "universal values," but to assume that these values in the East must have come from the West is incorrect. Responding to questions as to his preference between separate Western and Eastern civilization courses or one, integrated, global course, Prof. Buss outlined the relative merits of both approaches and concluded that universities should decide between the two in light of what the rest of their curriculums offer.

Dean Schaefer commented that one of the grave problems in civilization courses is that the instructor must function as an amateur for large segments of history, since he cannot be a professional in the entire sweep of even Western civilization. And if he must include Eastern civilization as well, he is being asked to behave as an ignoramus.

"Dealing with West and non-West as two separate entities in a sense destroys the very thing you are trying to achieve," remarked Prof. Wallbank. Prof. Buss concurred, stating he would prefer a global approach, where practicable, without East-West demarcation. Prof. Dunbar pointed out that inclusion of the East in civilization courses might be no more difficult than was the addition of other areas of the West into the old "Europe Since the Renaissance" courses.

Prof. Perkins cautioned against so broad an extension of the course, claiming it would place too great a strain on the teacher and render the content superficial. The fact that selective coverage will always be a problem in any survey course, Prof. Taylor countered, does not justify excising non-Western materials. In fact, the need for understanding between East and West is so urgent today that one might well argue that the college student needs "not re-exposure to the Western story, but primary exposure to the Eastern story." When the first world history courses appeared, virtually nobody was equipped to teach them. But in the decades since their appearance, interest and expertise in the planetary approach have been gained. If political science, economics, and other disciplines have had to "retool" in subject matter and method, the historian should consider similar adjustments. Prof. Wallbank agreed that for an instructor to prepare himself by judicious reading to teach a world history course was not at all "an insuperable problem."

Prof. Strayer concurred with Prof. Perkins' objections to a world survey course. "Gain a solid foundation in one civilization, and the obvious one is our own, and then the others will make more sense, " he said. A knowledge of the early Middle Ages, for example, will acquaint students with some of the problems of pre-industrial societies elsewhere. The whole gamut simply cannot be covered.

Prof. Bruun replied that when historiography was broadened to include wider cultural aspects, critics argued that it could not be done. The objections proved invalid then, and he opined that the difficulties under discussion might similarly prove more imaginary than real. Prof. Smith suggested that an instructor can teach a subject effectively in which he is not expert. But the real question, countered Prof. Strayer, is not so much the training of the instructor, but whether this is a good way to teach history.

The conference then analyzed deficiencies in present history of civilization courses. Observing that history is essentially a synthetic discipline with syncretism as its peculiar genius, Prof. Kelly listed various dilemmas which occur in civilization courses. Despite the syncretism necessary to their discipline, historians do not possess syncretistic minds. Finding an appropriate frame of reference is another difficulty: politics, because of its sharp time-space orientation, is still the best. There is the Toynbeean dilemma of "nation versus culture," which can be surmounted. Another is the dilemma of "cultural segments versus cultural synthesis": too many texts present merely confusing segments on medicine, music, literature, etc., in a given era rather than a true synthesis, which is the task of history. In the dilemma of "Being versus Becoming," historians have a habit of emphasizing causation to the exclusion of portraying the thing itself -- "Bourgeois society is always emerging, but where is bourgeois society?" -- Such eras as Periclean Athens, Augustan Rome, and the High Middle Ages should be treated in terms of both becoming and being. The dilemma of continuity and discontinuity in history, cited earlier, is perhaps best solved by stressing both. While these difficulties will continue to plague the course, it can, even as "a glorious failure," be one of the really inspiring centers of academic excitement on campus.

Prof. Cochrane thought that the problems associated with this course will vary, depending on the type of institution offering it. He viewed the course as basically an introduction to further study in history, and defined history as a discipline which gives both a sense of temporal connection among individual events and a sense of change through time. It ought also to give an appreciation of the value of the single phenomenon as opposed to a category or an abstract concept. One of the difficulties with civilization courses is that they tend to cover areas not belonging to the historical discipline, thus becoming hodgepodges of literary criticism, philosophy, economics, and other fields better left to appropriate specialists. Why must the history department be responsible for such general education, while colleagues in other departments continue to teach their specialties? The concept of time is most difficult to develop in students, and to Prof. Cochrane it could best be learned in a Western rather than in a world setting. Even in the Western strand, a "posthole" approach is preferable to a complete but superficial coverage. He contended that a specialist in a given area of history teaches a broad survey course better than a generalist. So, far from being a purgatory for the new, inexperienced instructor, it should be given to the mature teacher who has read, thought, and written more deeply. It certainly should not be taught by graduate students. Moreover, wrong methods of teaching are often employed in this course. Small discussion sections analyzing particular documents will teach more than lectures in introductory courses--a procedure most practicable, of course, in universities like Chicago with small classes and large faculties. Perhaps period monographs and documentary materials should replace textbooks.

Prof. Richard Sullivan identified three difficulties in teaching the course. First, the instructor has the burden of presenting a version of the past for which he may have no real conviction: the idea of man's progress through time. Secondly, the course involves the student in an intellectual operation for which he loses interest when told that he must take additional history courses in order to understand what really happened: many students take no more history. Thirdly, the course requires of the student a range of skills in which he has no adequate previous training: the ability to learn a great number of discrete facts, to read and understand expository material, and to reason in various categories. High schools do not adequately prepare students in such skills. Prof. Sullivan called for an investigation by the project committee of the assumptions underlying these courses.

Prof. Snell outlined what he considered good teaching of history at the college level. The instructor must get across to the student an awareness of time, process, and change. He must also raise questions in the minds of his students and accustom them to grappling with questions to develop the power of critical analysis. With deeper curiosity about the past, they must learn to sense contradictions and inadequacies in the answers historians have provided about the past -- "the questing approach." Finally, both the instructors and the courses must convey to students an awareness of multiple causation, of the complex character of each period in history, and of the ambiguous legacies which every movement leaves to the next and later periods in history. Now, civilization courses, while teaching well the concepts of time, process, and change, lack a desirable degree of the other essential qualities. The sciences do not attempt to cover astronomy, botany, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics, and zoology in a one-year course, nor should historians. Neither the student nor the instructor can do justice to a true civilization course. Accordingly, "instead of trying to improve the health of the college-level history of civilization course, we should give it as decent and quiet a burial as faculty relationships permit. We might hope that the high schools would continue to give it." As replacements, Prof. Snell suggested that medium-breadth courses, such as Medieval, modern European, or Latin American history could avoid narrow specialization while providing the desirable depth qualities missing from civilization courses.

* * *

Prof. Snell's suggestion of abandoning the civilization course entirely elicited spirited discussion. Prof. Wallbank thought Prof. Snell's substitutions would pile too heavy a burden on the freshman course: how can the student who will not take additional history courses develop the desired critical and rational skills in a single year, he asked. Prof. Perkins added that dropping the civilization course was not a live option, since it was too firmly embedded in the academic system; the only choice was to improve it. Prof. Strayer also doubted that a specialized course would be appropriate for freshmen, who lack the necessary background for it. "Students have been accustomed to the superficial so much that it is essential to break them from it," replied Prof. Snell, to which Prof. Wallbank countered that the Snell plan would be too specialistic and impractical for the requirements of mass education at the average university, citing experiences at the University of Southern California in support of his position.

In partial defense of Prof. Snell, Dean Schaefer stated that students who had gone into depth at three or four points in a survey course invariably did better on a general test of retention of information and understanding of scope than those who had covered the course on an "equal-emphasis" basis.

Following a presentation by Dr. Van Bolt on the special role of the civilization course at junior and community colleges, the conference discussed queries raised by Prof. Dunbar as to the roles of the textbook, readings, lectures, and discussion periods in civilization courses. Prof. Smith theorized that too much matter-of-fact knowledge has been inserted into lectures and texts. More emphasis on selected themes, ideas, men, and "directional thrusts" in history is desirable. Several authors present explained the criteria they used in selecting materials for inclusion in their textbooks. Prof. Wallbank elucidated his "world" approach, and Prof. Strayer stated that while he personally did not like textbooks, they were necessary to guide the student. Freshmen cannot be turned loose on courses without interpretation, he said, and consequently the most pressing problem in the course is not what it contains, but how it is taught.

Prof. Thomas observed that in a general education program, no subject other than English is more indispensable than history. There should be more emphasis on history in basic studies, not just as facts and the explanation of these facts, but on the "art of history," that is, the way in which historians make their interpretations. The project could serve a very useful purpose by discovering what kinds of history are being taught in higher education today.

A discussion followed on whether the conference should go on record as being in favor of continuing or dropping the civilization course. The consensus was that it was premature to offer any such judgment. Practical considerations seemed to indicate, many felt, that the course will continue to be given. The problem, accordingly, was how to improve the present course, although Prof. Snell suggested that questionnaires used in the project should include the basic query of whether the course might be replaced.

In his paper on "History of Civilization Courses Outside the United States," Canadian Prof. Alastair Taylor observed that many of the problems discussed at the conference have also been recognized in the British tradition. At Oxford, he reported, history lectures emphasize traditional subject matter, primarily British history prior to the twentieth century and Western European ideas and institutions. Along with this general imbalance, there were, as of 1959, several startling omissions in their program, notably, no lectures on the history of the Far East, Latin America, Australia, or Canada. The college-preparatory schools in England have not been offering a world history course. A comparable situation exists in the Scottish universities, but pressures for broader coverage in history are rising in Great Britain. Canadian universities generally do offer courses in civilization during the first or second year, usually surveys in Western rather than world civilization, which extend typically from the decline of the Roman Empire to the present. But these courses are now being broadened to include non-Western areas and cultures, and to deal with technology and science. Canadian high schools generally offer a two-year, eleventh-and-twelfth-grade sequence of world history courses, arranged chronologically.

Prof. Cochrane reported that in Italy no comparable civilization course is offered other than in the lycée, "a thing which gives most of the students a great collection of facts from the founding of Rome to the present." Prof. Buss said that many Japanese scholars are conferring on precisely the same questions being discussed at the present conference.

Dean Schaefer addressed himself to the question, "Is Special Preparation for Instructors in History of Civilization Desirable?" He advised no special substantive preparation for them, since in order to understand the discipline in which he works, the scholar must probe it in depth. Specialized graduate training for teaching this course would be unwise for another reason: the graduate's career possibilities would be severely limited to a few institutions and to this particular course. Dean Schaefer supported his statements by relating negative experiences in the attempt to train generalists in the field of education. Certain kinds of pedagogical preparation, however, might well be provided prospective teachers in history of civilization. The instructor must also face the reality that he will probably make little impact on most of his students, at least in terms of what he would like to accomplish. He should have a broad comprehension of other basic disciplines, partially to free him from the notion that his course alone is responsible for the general education of his students. Pedagogical training should not be carried on in an academic setting or in courses about teaching; rather, analysis and discussion of teaching should proceed as an individual is engaged in the actual process of instruction. Dean Schaefer concluded by commenting that rewards in rank and salary must be available for teachers assigned to civilization courses.

The discussion concluded with such topics as graduate seminars in civilization, the role of junior colleges, the relationship of civilization courses to general education, and the feasibility of "sixth-year," post-Master's degree graduate programs.

Finally, the conference considered a national research project to seek the improvement of courses in the history of civilization. The idea found much support among the consultants, and guidelines for the contemplated investigation were developed. Since the course differs so widely from college to college, a necessary first step would be to survey the varying nature of the course nationally. Content, structure, scope, goals, strengths, weaknesses, and areas requiring improvement would have to be determined through questionnaires, and for these Profs. Perkins and Snell provided valuable advice derived from their previous study. Interviews at selected, representative institutions were particularly stressed, and other procedures for obtaining information were suggested and evaluated. It was decided that student opinion should also be canvassed. Profs. Snell and Strayer suggested possible endorsement of the project by the American Historical Association.

After the data from questionnaires and interviews had been analyzed and ideas for improvement studied, it was suggested that several alternative course models might be devised to accommodate the diverse needs of American colleges and universities for an improved history of civilization course -- or an entirely different one, if Prof. Snell's strictures proved to be widely shared. The consultants strongly favored the continuation of the project and predicted that it could make an invaluable contribution to higher education in the United States.

B. Conference Implementation by the Project Committee

1. Preliminary Interviews

In the months following the conference, history and/or basic studies departments at these institutions were visited by the director or assistant director of the project:

Brown University
City College of New York
Cornell University
Harvard University
Indiana University
MacMurray College
Rice University
St. Louis University

State U. of New York (Buffalo)
University of Houston
University of Minnesota
University of Nebraska
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
University of Tennessee
Washington University

Yale University

Soundings on the campuses of these 17 colleges and universities -- 3 in New England, 5 in the middle Atlantic states, 6 in the north central, and 3 in the south central states -- revealed that a history-oriented survey course was taught in almost all these institutions. So common was it that one professor suggested the course be given a common number to facilitate transfers and comparisons. These interviews showed that the course nearly always dealt with Western civilization, touching only those non-Western topics required by the story of the Western world: Islam and imperialism, most commonly. The non-Western world was usually omitted, not because of a failure to appreciate its importance, but because it was thought to deserve its own time in the junior or senior years.

No true consensus appeared as to the scope of the history of civilization course. Perhaps the most common sweep was from Mesopotamia and Egypt to the present. Some courses began with Greece, some with the end of the Roman Empire, some with the Reformation, and one at 1848. Most frequently a two-semester, three-hour-credit-per-semester offering, the breaking points between semesters varied from 1300 to 1714 A.D. The usual pattern of presentation was two lectures, one discussion period per week. As an alternative to the discussion meeting, some courses reserved the last 10 minutes or so of the lecture period for questions, in the belief that the best time for discussion is when queries and ideas are fresh.

Often the course was required, especially in a basic studies context; but even when not required it seemed to be popular and well attended. More often than not, instructors enjoyed considerable leeway in such matters as readings, examinations, and emphases. Perhaps this freedom is a tacit acknowledgement of something often forgotten or taken for granted, that even the most carefully organized course depends for its impact on the insights, skills, and personal qualities of the instructor.

While standardized textbooks were used widely, supplementary readings were usually controlled by individual instructors. In other institutions, a series of monographs replaced the text. Departmental examinations were administered in some universities, individualized tests at others.

Faculty attitudes toward the course appeared generally favorable. Typical dissatisfaction was expressed with the necessity of presenting so broad a sweep of history, but many instructors preferred to cover the material rather than excise important segments. And breadth was regarded as one of the prime values of the course. Those professors who suggested reduction of scope almost invariably wished the compression to take place in eras other than their own specialties! One of the 17 institutions interviewed could not solve problems of scope in its civilization course and abandoned it. However, there appeared to be much dissatisfaction with the courses substituted.

Many interviewees expressed dissatisfaction with the high-school preparation of their students. The skills necessary for history courses had not been mastered, probably because most world history courses come too early in high school. Some instructors attempted introductory history information quizzes on their new students and were appalled at the results.

A general trend toward mass lecture sections was evident, but there was little interest, or use, of closed-circuit television in teaching civilization courses. Discussion sections, where used, were typically limited to an average of 20 to 30 students.

The courses surveyed almost invariably were taught by the history departments. In colleges with separate divisions of basic, general, or liberal studies, other departments undoubtedly share the teaching, especially if the course leans heavily toward the humanities.

Colleges in New England appeared to offer the older, strictly European civilization course, some beginning as late as Charlemagne and others no earlier than the fall of Rome. Colleges in the Mideast and Midwest, on the other hand, had often broadened their courses to include the ancient world. One Midwestern university was developing a global history course, not monopolized by Western or even Eastern civilizations.

A final conclusion seemed clear: there was little or no intermural investigation or exchange with regard to the organization, content, merits, or faults of one of the most common and popular college courses. At the same time, there was much concern about the civilization course, much eagerness to exchange experiences and learn how it was being handled on other campuses. Many professors who were interviewed asked for transcripts of the developmental conference held at Western Michigan University and offered their services in a continuing study. Most applauded the idea of a project to improve the course, some suggesting specific items which were subsequently incorporated in the questionnaires prepared by the project committee.

2. Research Instruments

Nine questionnaires for use in a national research project to improve history of civilization courses were developed by the project committee. Intended for general and selected American institutions of higher learning, the questionnaires were designed to seek the following types of information:

a. Data on the course as now taught: the number and proportion of institutions offering a civilization course; the academic preparation, experience, rank, and highest degrees of the staff members teaching this course; administration and supervision; objectives of the course; scheduling of classes; scope and content of the course; and how it fulfills institutional requirements for the bachelor's degree and departmental requirements for the major and minor in history.

b. Appraisal of the course as now taught: by history department chairmen; directors of basic, general, or liberal studies; instructional staff members; and students, seniors, and alumni who have taken the course. Specific strengths and weaknesses of the course are to be identified.

c. Ideas and suggestions for improving the course: from the same sources as listed immediately above.

d. Suggested alternatives to this course: provided by institutions which do not offer it and by history department chairmen; directors of basic, general, or liberal studies; and instructional staff members in institutions which do offer the course but who may prefer a substitute.

e. Information on the academic background of instructors in this course, to be obtained from history department chairmen in institutions offering the course, distinguishing those which grant the Ph.D. degree in history; directors of general, basic, or liberal studies; and members of instructional staffs.

f. Evaluation of high-school preparation of students for this course, to be secured from students taking the course and from their instructors.

The following series of questionnaires has been prepared, all of which are supplied in their entirety in Appendix B of this report:

Questionnaire HCP 1 is intended for the head or chairman of the history department in each accredited college, university, and junior college in the United States. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide a comprehensive view of the status of the course as now taught, opinion concerning it, ideas for improving it, and suggested alternatives.

Questionnaire HCP 2 is intended for the director of general, basic, or liberal studies in every four-year college or university where a distinctive division or unit of the undergraduate course of study for general, basic, or liberal studies has been formed. This questionnaire should yield comprehensive data concerning the place of the civilization course in the general studies curriculum.

Questionnaires HCP 3 through HCP 7 are to be used in connection with studies in depth of the status of the civilization course and possible improvements at some 80 selected institutions. (The criteria to be used in selecting these institutions are presented in section 3. below.) Questionnaire HCP 3 is intended for staff members teaching the civilization course; HCP 4, for a sampling of students taking the course during the second semester or quarter; HCP 5, for a sampling of seniors who took the course as freshmen or sophomores; HCP 6, for a sampling of teaching alumni; and HCP 7, for a sampling of non-teaching alumni.

Questionnaire HCP 8 is intended for the head or chairman of the department of history in each university offering the Ph.D. in history.

Questionnaire HCP 9 is intended for the head or chairman of the department of history at selected institutions which do not offer a civilization course, and, if such an official exists, for the director of general, basic, or liberal studies at the same institutions.

The questionnaires which are to be sent to a large number of institutions (HCP 1 and 2) should be accompanied by covering letters which set forth the purpose of the study, request cooperation, and promise to share the findings. The remaining questionnaires, to be distributed through the selected institutions after a preparatory visit by one of the project staff members, should be of particular value in revealing new practices and ideas concerning the civilization course. These instruments, however, will only supplement interviews and local conferences conducted by the visiting staff member.

Questionnaires HCP 1 and 2 should be distributed first, so that data from these can be used in selecting the institutions for intensive study.

3. Criteria to be Used in Selecting Institutions for Intensive Study

After analysis of returns from the general research questionnaire HCP 1, distributed to all American colleges and universities, and from HCP 2, reflecting general education programs, project staff interviewers are to visit a selected list of approximately 80 representative institutions in order to conduct studies in depth by means of interviews, conferences, and Questionnaires HCP 3 through 7. The criteria employed in making this selection are as follows:

a. The number of institutions was set arbitrarily at about 80, a figure which appeared large enough to allow for a cross section of colleges and universities in different parts of the country and yet small enough to be manageable.

b. The selection is to hinge, in part, on whether the department heads and staff members contacted will participate in the study. If cooperation is not evidenced, an alternate college or university in the same geographical and institutional category is to be chosen.

c. The selection is to be based initially on institutional type in proportion to undergraduate enrollment. Institutional types listed here are an adaptation of those cited in Edith M. Huddleston, Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1963 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1963):

- Public universities
- Private universities
- Public liberal arts colleges
- Private liberal arts colleges
- Public junior colleges
- Private junior colleges
- Independently organized teachers colleges
- Technological schools
- Theological schools, schools of art, and other private professional schools

d. The selection is also to be by regions, as classified by Huddleston (op. cit., p.8) in proportion to the ratio of the number of undergraduates in the institutions of each region to the total undergraduate enrollment. The regions are as follows:

New England: Conn., Me., Mass., N.H., R.I., Vt.
Mideast: Del., D.C., Md., N.J., N.Y., Pa.
Great Lakes: Ill., Ind., O., Mich., Wis.
Plains: Iowa, Kan., Minn., Mo., Neb., N. Dak., S. Dak.
Southeast: Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N. Car., S. Car., Tenn., Va., W. Va.
Southwest: Ariz., N. Mex., Okla., Tex.
Mountain: Colo., Idaho, Mont., Ut., Wyo.

Far West: Alas., Cal., Haw., Nev., Ore., Wash.
Service schools and outlying parts .

e. A history of civilization course must have been offered for at least four years in institutions to be selected. However, a limited number of colleges and universities which do not offer a civilization course are also to be selected, particularly in connection with Questionnaire HCP 9.

f. A considerable number in each category, but not more than one-third, are to be "prestige institutions," since these strongly influence others in their category.

g. The selection is to include some institutions which incorporate the non-Western world in the civilization course, and some which do not. The proportion is to be determined by the returns from Questionnaire HCP 1, that is, the number of institutions offering world civilizations included in the list should be in the same proportion to the total as in the returns to HCP 1.

h. Institutions are to be included which have made notable studies or have achieved recognized success in the teaching of the civilization course. While the returns from Questionnaires HCP 1 and 2 should provide comprehensive data on the typical course, the purpose of this depth study at selected institutions is to discover how the course may be improved as well as to investigate alternatives to it.

The following is the statistical data on which the selection of the 80 representative institutions is to be based. The number of colleges and universities selected in each region is to correspond to the proportion of the number of undergraduates in that region to the total for the United States, and to some extent to the proportion of the number of institutions in that region to the total for the United States. The data here cited were derived from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, 1964), p. 134:

Region	Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment in 1962	Percentage of Total U.S. Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment	Number of Institutions	Percentage of number of Institutions to U.S. total
New England	170,172	6.7	193	9.1
Mideast	447,430	17.6	428	20.1
Great Lakes	487,247	19.2	355	16.5
Plains	266,846	10.4	258	12.1
Southeast	493,281	19.3	449	21.1
Southwest	219,691	8.6	148	6.8
Mountain	86,155	3.3	55	2.5
Far West	352,614	13.8	239	11.2
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Areas	30,768	1.1	13	.6

The differences between the percentage of total undergraduate enrollment in each region (full-time plus part-time), the percentage of full-time undergraduate enrollment only, and the percentage of total enrollment (undergraduate plus graduate) do not appear to be substantial enough to affect the selection materially, as shown in this computation:

Region	Percentage of Total U.S. Full-time Undergraduate Enrollment	Percentage of Total Undergraduate Enrollment in 1962	Percentage of Total Enrollment (Graduate and Undergraduate) in Fall, 1963
New England	6.7	6.1	7
Mideast	17.6	19.2	20
Great Lakes	19.2	19.0	19
Plains	10.4	9.1	9
Southeast	19.3	17.2	16
Southwest	8.6	8.4	9
Mountain	3.3	2.8	3
Far West	13.8	17.1	16
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Areas	1.1	1.1	1

These data indicate that the percentage and number of institutions to be selected from each region should be in the following approximate ranges:

Region	Range of Percentages to be Selected	Range of Numbers of Institutions to be Selected (% applied to 80)
New England	6 to 9 %	5 to 7
Mideast	17 to 20 %	13 to 16
Great Lakes	16 to 19 %	12 to 15
Plains	10 to 12 %	8 to 9
Southeast	17 to 21 %	13 to 17
Southwest	7 to 9 %	5 to 7
Mountain	2 to 4 %	2 to 3
Far West	11 to 17 %	10 to 14
U.S. Service Schools and Outlying Areas	1 to 2 %	1 to 2

To determine the approximate number of institutions of each type to be selected, the fall, 1963, undergraduate enrollment for each type was estimated, and the percentage of the total undergraduate enrollment for each type was calculated. These percentages were then applied to 80, the number of institutions to be selected. Total enrollments for fall, 1963, are from Huddleston, _op_. _cit_., pp. 5-8. Percentage of total enrollment classified as undergraduate is from Wayne E. Tolliver, _Enrollment for Advanced Degrees, Fall, 1960_ (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1963), pp. 5-20.

(next page)

Institutional Type	Total Enrollment Fall ,1963	Percentage of Undergraduates	Undergraduate enrollment (estimated)	Percentage of Total Undergraduate enrollment
Public universities	1,318,362	88.0	1,160,159	28.3
Private universities	587,569	81.9	481,169	11.7
Public liberal arts colleges	510,054	92.8	473,310	11.5
Private liberal arts colleges	781,680	96.3	742,918	18.1
Public junior colleges	553,302	100.0	553,302	13.5
Private junior colleges	74,504	100.0	74,504	1.8
Independently organized teachers colleges	436,944	[1]	405,489	9.9
Technological schools	132,756	[2]	116,825	2.8
Other professional schools	103,345	[3]	98,512	2.4
Totals:	4,528,516		4,106,188	100.0

---

[1] 93.1 for public teachers colleges; 83.4 for private teachers colleges
[2] 95.3 for public technical schools; 82.5 for private technical schools
[3] 92.8 for theological and religious schools; 96.6 for others

Applying the percentage of total undergraduate enrollment in each type of institution to 80, the following represents the approximate number of institutions of each type which are to be selected (percentages in the extreme right-hand column above applied to 80):

Public universities:	22
Private universities:	10
Public liberal arts colleges:	9
Private liberal arts colleges:	14
Public junior colleges:	8*
Private junior colleges:	3**
Independently organized teachers colleges (public and private):	8
Technological schools (public and private):	3**
Other professional schools (public and private):	3**
Total:	80

---

*The number of public junior colleges included is somewhat smaller than their undergraduate enrollment appears to warrant. The project committee believed that more significant data on trends and possible improvements could be gained from four-year institutions.

**Where the percentage of undergraduate enrollment is relatively small, at least three institutions are to be included.

The 80 institutions selected are to be a correlation of the regional apportionment (the final column on page 22) and the allotment by institutional type (the column immediately above). Thus, at least one public university and one private liberal arts college are to be selected from each of the eight geographical regions in the United States, not including U.S. service schools and outlying regions. Similarly, at least one private university, one public liberal arts college, and one public junior college are to be selected from each of the eight regions, except Mountain.

Insofar as feasible, independent teachers colleges are to be chosen from different regions. With regard to private junior colleges and technical schools, however, regional location should be less determinative of selection, although where possible, the three institutions selected for each of these two types should be in different regions.

At least one professional school and one U.S. service college are to be included.

The additional public universities and private liberal arts colleges selected should be those which satisfy criteria cited earlier and which can make an effective contribution to the investigation.

4. Procedural Guidelines for a National Civilization Course Improvement Project

Finally, the project committee developed a proposed schedule of phases which might be employed in a contemplated national research project to improve history of civilization courses. It is estimated that an investigation of this nature would require three years to complete. The following suggested stages of research are listed chronologically.

a. Distribution of Questionnaire HCP 1 to history department chairmen at all accredited American colleges and universities.

b. Distribution of Questionnaire HCP 2 to chairmen of general, basic, or liberal studies programs at all institutions with such departments or divisions. The results from HCP 1 will identify these schools.

c. Staff interviews at 80 representative colleges, universities, junior colleges, and other schools, to be selected on the basis of criteria cited in 3. above.

d. Distribution of the remaining Questionnaires, HCP 3 through 7 at the 80 selected institutions, HCP 8 and 9 by mail.

e. Compilation of data from the questionnaires and analysis of these as well as the results of the 80 studies in depth of selected institutions.

f. Convening conferences to discuss the findings of the instruments and interviews. These should including the following:

(1) A conference of chairmen of general, basic, or liberal studies divisions or programs in four-year colleges and

universities to consider returns from Questionnaire HCP 2, and to clarify the role of the civilization course as part of the general education requirements for degrees.

(2) A conference of selected instructors in the civilization course who have achieved notable success in the organization and presentation of the material. Through interchange of ideas and analysis of the data secured by the project, this conference should evaluate proposals for improving the course and suggest others.

(3) A conference of deans, department heads, and others involved in university graduate programs in history. The objective should be to appraise and apply suggestions for improving the training and preparation of instructors in the history of civilization.

(4) A conference on the learning process as related to the civilization course. Leading authorities in the fields of educational research and cognitive psychology should be invited, along with a smaller number of recognized instructors. This conference should seek to apply the latest research on the learning process to the organization and presentation of the course.

g. Preparation of several model history of civilization courses, including syllabi, based on conclusions drawn from the instruments, interviews, data, and conferences.

h. Dissemination in monographic form of the results of the investigation and the course models to all American institutions of higher learning.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Because this was a developmental program, several of the conclusions listed here will require further testing in the research project proposed in this report. Nevertheless, the consensus of the conference consultants and the preliminary interviews appear to justify the following conclusions:

1. A study of history of civilization courses ought to be made. The course occupies too crucial a position in the curriculum to be neglected further.

2. Because civilization courses differ so widely from campus to campus in terms of scope, content, and presentation, local factors play a dominant role in the success or difficulties of a given course.

3. Attitudes of both conference consultants and those expressed

during preliminary interviews indicate a majority support for the basic history of civilization course, and some minority opinion in favor of abandoning it. This tentative conclusion, however, should be tested in a larger research project.

4. No full agreement exists on the objectives of civilization courses.

5. More clarification of the role of this course in general education programs would be desirable.

6. Values cited in support of the course included benefits for both faculty and students. Especially stressed were such advantages as temporal orientation, a sense of process and change, a liaison or integrative function, de-parochialization of the student, the advisability of survey before specialization, and a sense of interplay between the humanistic and scientific cultures.

7. Faults of civilization courses were often thought to reflect circumstances peculiar to each campus. Nevertheless, some deficiencies appeared to be general, among them: superficiality, inadequate student skills, improper pedagogy, low faculty morale regarding this course, and lack of opportunity for students to deal critically and in depth with course content.

8. There was general agreement that the most pressing problem in civilization courses was not so much what the course contains, but how it is taught. At the same time, there was no consensus as to the best teaching techniques for these courses. It was recommended that a larger investigation should identify criteria for judging superior methods of instruction.

9. Since only hazy recollections of past successes and failures with this course exist, there was some support for a history of the civilization course itself.

10. The problem of whether to integrate Eastern civilization with Western civilization or to present them in separate courses needs careful study. Some conferees were opposed to inclusion of non-Western content in an already overburdened Western civilization course, while others favored such additions. In general, the Western emphasis in civilization courses appears to predominate.

11. There was no consensus on the problem of temporal scope -- whether, for example, to begin the course with Mesopotamia or the Middle Ages -- but the trend toward greater emphasis on recent centuries was discernible. Many instructors interviewed argued for greater standardization in the matter of scope.

12. "Posthole" studies of the most significant historical eras along with adequate continuity were generally thought superior for purposes of this course rather than blanket coverage of the entire past.

13. Conference consultants emphasized that more of science and

technology should be included in civilization courses. While sharing this viewpoint, some interviewees pointed out that many history of civilization textbooks and courses had already incorporated this emphasis.

14. Concern was expressed for improving the graduate training of prospective professors of history, particularly in the area of pedagogical guidance. At several institutions, a faculty-graduate seminar in civilization has proven very helpful to both new and experienced instructors in these courses.

15. There was no consensus as to whether or not graduate assistants should teach civilization courses. Nevertheless, this practice appears prevalent.

16. Although more pedagogical guidance should be involved in the preparation of instructors in the history of civilization, most conference consultants and instructors interviewed felt that a special graduate program for such instructors -- at least one leading to a terminal degree -- would be inadvisable.

17. Both the conference and subsequent interviews revealed a general agreement that high-school preparation for this course was inadequate, primarily due to the fact that students take world history too early in high school, or fail to take it at all. A qualitative improvement in the high-school course was also desired.

18. The consultants and most of the instructors interviewed gave this project and its objectives their general endorsement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This preliminary bibliography for a study of history of civilization courses identifies resources germane to any concern for improving, or, indeed, replacing such offerings. A bibliographical essay was thought preferable to a typical listing.

I. General Education

As civilization courses are often taught in the context of general education programs, attention must be given to the assumptions, problems, and criticisms of the general education approach. The most significant statement on the purposes of basic or liberal studies is *General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1946). A more substantial historical context and an examination of current programs at 18 institutions of higher learning is provided in Russell B. Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962). Representative of the continuing critical examination of general education in the education periodicals are Bernard Wishy, "General Education *in Extremis*," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXXIV (May, 1963), 270-77, and Herbert Weisinger, "In Criticism of General Education," *Journal of General Education*, XV(October, 1963), 161-174. One institution's response to recognized shortcomings, particularly as revealed in a self study, is delineated in Morris Keeton and Ruth Churchill, "Antioch Redesigns its General Education Program," *Journal of General Education*, X (July, 1957), 145-149. A survey of student reactions to general education, mostly favorable, provides the substance for Paul L. Dressel, "Student Views Regarding General Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXIX (January, 1958), 41-46. Social studies programs, including history of civilization courses, are most fully covered in Albert W. Levi, *General Education in the Social Studies* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1948), which sets forth the findings of a five-year cooperative study involving some 25 colleges. A brief for the essential role of history is provided by William Verhage, "History in General Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXX (October, 1959), 383-390. The tendency to develop integrative courses at the senior level is noted by W. Hugh Stickler, "Senior Courses in General Education," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXV (March, 1954), 139-146. Ernest R. Hilgard, "General Education at the Graduate Level," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXV (June, 1955), 294-297, makes a plea for modifying the Ph.D. program to provide for continuing general education. The experience of 23 public institutions in the Midwest is surveyed in Kenneth R. Walker, "Problems in General Education in State-Supported Schools," *Journal of General Education*, XII (July, 1961), 128-144.

II. Descriptions and Critiques of Civilization Courses

The periodical literature on history of civilization courses in general is largely of a critical nature. A plea for the abolition of such offerings, at least on the freshman level, is made in Louis E. Bumgartner, "For Teachers of Courses Called Western Civilization: A Lament," AAUP Bulletin, XLIX (June, 1963), 123-124. A more hopeful view is taken by R. V. Sires, "Another Look at 'Chaos 101'," AAUP Bulletin, XLIX (December, 1963), 370-371, who advocates an exclusive concern with "the most noteworthy achievements of man (or Western man) in the most significant fields of human activity." Richard Bardolph, "The Required Freshman History Course," Journal of Higher Education, XXI (December, 1950), 451 ff., 494 f., is also concerned with ways of improving course structure and content. The question of world civilization versus Western civilization, favoring the latter, is discussed by John T. Horton, "Historismus for the Undergraduate," Journal of General Education, II (October, 1947), 27-34. Though largely concerned with world civilization courses in high schools, Louis M. Bouchard, "Realistic Approach to the Study of World Cultures," Peabody Journal of Education, XLI (March, 1964), 266-269, makes some noteworthy comments on civilization courses and texts at the college level. Guidelines for the establishment of history-oriented general courses are the concern of Lewis A. Dexter, "On the Construction of Social Science General Courses," Journal of General Education, II (April, 1948), 219-226.

Perhaps most fruitful for the purposes of this study is the literature drawn from the experience of specific institutions with civilization programs and courses. Charles C. Cole, Jr., "History in a General Education Program at Columbia College," Journal of Higher Education, XXVII (October, 1956), 359-363, 407, describes Columbia's successful Contemporary Civilization sequence. Of a similar nature are Milton Singer, "The Social Science Program in the College of the University of Chicago," Journal of General Education, II (April, 1948), 251-258, and Melville J. Herskovits, "The Social Science Units of the Northwestern University Liberal Arts Program," Journal of General Education, I (April, 1947), 216-223. The experience of Bates College is described in Roy P. Fairfield, "Plumbing Our Cultural Heritage," Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (February, 1957), 75-82, and Eastern Kentucky's six-hour senior course provides the basis for Kerney M. Adams, "Ideological Foundations of Western Civilization," Journal of Higher Education, XXVII (December, 1956), 489-495, 513. Leo J. Alilunas, "General Education in the Social Studies at a Teachers College," Social Studies, XLIV (February, 1953), 61-64, gives the rationale for changing the basic freshman history course from a history of civilization to modern world civilization. The two-semester "man-and-society" style course at Dickinson College is favorably viewed by Robert A. Dentler, "General Education in Social Science: A Small Liberal Arts College Program," Journal of General Education, XII (April, 1959), 113-118. A demurrer is entered by Paul A. Smith, "Social Science at Dickinson Four Years Later: A Communication," Journal of General Education, XII (October, 1959), 205-208. Junior college experiences are described by Leo Trepp, "Social Sciences and Humanities in Junior College," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXIII (May, 1958), 280-286, and by Peter Senn, "A New General Course in Social Science," Journal of General Education, XIII (April, 1961), 53-66.

Another area of interest is touched by articles dealing with specific measures or devices designed to improve the quality of civilization offerings. Course organization is discussed in Harry F. Jackson, "Civilization by Stages," Social Studies, XLVI (December, 1955), 298-299. Dealing with the same theme is a series of articles by Edith West, Joseph R. Strayer, Lefton S. Stavrianos, and Ethel E. Ewing which constitutes a provocative chapter, "Promising Ways of Organizing a World History Course," in Shirley H. Engle, ed., New Perspectives in World History (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1964), 585-624. Although this yearbook is concerned with world history in secondary schools, many of the articles by established scholars should prove useful to this study. Another device is suggested by George Sinkler, "History Clinic: A Way to Broaden the World Civilization Course," Social Studies, XLVIII (October, 1957), 208-214. The impact of textbooks on student thinking is the concern of Sherman B. Barnes, "The Relation of Science and the Humanities in College History of Civilization Textooks," Religious Education, LVI (March, 1961), 108-113, 143.

Some attention must also be given the views of the Anglo-Catholic historian, Christopher Dawson, who considers Christian culture of ascendant importance as an integrative force in the study of Western civilization. Many of his articles are conveniently gathered in Christopher H. Dawson, The Crisis of Western Education (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961). An evaluation of programs that grew out of Dawson's proposals is made by John P. Gleason, "The Study of Christian Culture: A New Approach to General Education," Educational Record, XL (April, 1959), 155-158.

The emergence of the Afro-Asian nations and the continuing international role of the United States is reflected in a growing interest in non-Western civilizations within the compass of world history courses and in courses dealing specifically with non-Western civilizations. The educational journals reflect this trend with an increase in the number of descriptive and analytical articles dealing with such courses. Experience at the University of Michigan is described by Robert I. Crane, "The Role of the Introductory Asia Course in Undergraduate Education," Journal of General Education, XII (July, 1959), 164-169. The Oriental Studies program at Columbia College is the basis for William T. de Bary, "Asian Studies for Undergraduates," Journal of Higher Education, XXX (January, 1959), 1-7. Harvard's course in Far Eastern civilizations is portrayed by John K. Fairbank, "East Asia in General Education: Philosophy and Practice," Journal of General Education, XII (April, 1959), 100-103. The Journal of General Education, XII (January, 1959), 22-49, contains a series of articles covering the various areas encompassed by the University of Chicago program: Milton Singer, "Chicago's Non-Western Civilization Program," 22-23; Myron Weiner, "The Study of Indian Civilization at the University of Chicago: Needs and Choices," 24-28; H. G. Creel, "Chinese Culture and Liberal Education," 29-38; and Marshall Hodgson, "A Non-Western Civilization Course in Liberal Education with Special Attention to the Case of Islam," 39-49. The experience at another type of institution is set forth in Martha L. Corry, "A Teachers College Develops an Eastern Cultures Course," Social Education, XXIII (April, 1959), 163-165. Certain problems connected with such courses are discussed by Arthur F. Wright, "The Study of Chinese Civilization," Journal of the History of Ideas, XXI (April-June, 1960), 233-255, concerned with the Western scholar's changing view of Chinese civilization, and by Harry A. Walbruck, "Objectivity in Civilization Courses," Modern Language Journal, XLVI (January, 1962), 29-30, commenting on the difficulties in achieving objectivity in treating cultures other than our own.

III. Pedagogy and the Preparation of Teachers

One of the finest introductions to the craft of college teaching is Gilbert Highet, The Art of Teaching (New York: Knopf, 1950). Though not so directly concerned with the art of pedagogy, Jacques Barzun, Teacher in America (Boston: Little, Brown, 1945) is rewarding. Characteristics of the good teacher are the concern of Earl J. McGrath, "Characteristics of Outstanding College Teachers," Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII (March, 1962), 148-152; Sawyer Falk, "The Sons of Acestes: the Attributes of Great Teaching," Journal of Higher Education, XXXII (November, 1961), 417-424; and Robert M. Davies, "The Effective Teacher," Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (May, 1957), 239-245, 293. The other side of the coin, the shortcomings of college teaching, are described by Howard Stein, "The Convenient Assumption," Journal of Higher Education, XXVII (February, 1956), 87-91, 116. Plans for improving college teaching are offered by Elmer Ellis, "Making Competent Teachers of New Instructors," Journal of Higher Education, XXV (April, 1954), 204-206, and Ordway Tead, "Are College Teachers Interested in Education?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII (April, 1962), 207-211. Teacher-rating methods are evaluated by N. L. Gage, "The Appraisal of College Teaching," Journal of Higher Education, XXXII (January, 1961), 17-22. The historian in the classroom attracts the attention of Whitaker T. Deininger, "Some Twentieth-Century Historians and the American Classroom," Journal of General Education, XII (January, 1959), 70-79. The three final chapters of Dexter Perkins and John L. Snell, The Education of Historians in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962) give attention to the problems of teacher preparation in the Ph.D. program and offer suggestions for improvement. This aspect of the book is further elaborated in a series of review essays in "The Historian in the United States--Teacher or Scholar?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXIII (June, 1962), 337-345.

The peculiar problems of preparing the general education instructor are taken up by L. J. Hetenyi, "Who Will Teach the General Education Student?" Journal of Higher Education, XXIX (March, 1958), 141-148; Earl M. Tapley, "Preparation for Teaching General Education Courses in Junior Colleges," School Review, LXIV (April, 1956), 191-196; and Horace T. Morse, "Social Studies Teachers for College Programs of General Education," in Jack Allen, ed., The Teacher of the Social Studies (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1952), 82-112. A problem of material concern is touched by Sigmund Nosow, "The Labor Market for Teachers of General Education," Journal of General Education, XI (January, 1958), 45-50.

IV. *Methodology and Viewpoints*

Recently published bibliographies on historiography and the philosophy of history render any substantial listing here redundant. John C. Rule, "Bibliography of Works in the Philosophy of History, 1945-1957," *History and Theory: Studies in the Philosophy of History*, Beiheft I (1961), is comprehensive for the period covered. Martin Klein, "Bibliography of Writings on Historiography and the Philosophy of History," in Louis Gottschalk, ed., *Generalization in the Writing of History: A Report of the Committee on Historical Analysis of the Social Science Research Council* (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1963), 213-247, is selective and was designed as a supplement to Ronald Thompson, "Selective Reading List on Historiography and Philosophy of History," in *Theory and Practice in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1946), 141-163.

The growing concern to enrich and refine historical methodology, of particular pertinence in the study of civilizations, is reflected in Hugh G. J. Aitken, ed., *The Social Sciences in Historical Study: A Report of the Committee on Historiography* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1954). Particular aspects of an interdisciplinary approach are considered by Richard D. Challener and Maurice Lee, Jr., "History and the Social Sciences: The Problem of Communications," *American Historical Review*, LXI (January, 1956), 331-338, and Sylvia Thrupp, "History and Sociology: New Opportunities for Cooperation," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXIII (July, 1957), 11-16. That British historians are similarly engaged is shown by Alfred Cobban, "History and Sociology," *Historical Studies*, III (1961), 1-8. The usefulness of the concepts of cultural anthropology in the understanding of history is set forth by a disciple of the late A. L. Kroeber in Philip Bagby, *Culture and History: Prolegomena to the Comparative Study of Civilizations* (Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1959). That historians have not been wholly remiss in utilizing such concepts is demonstrated by Carolyn F. Ware, ed., *The Cultural Approach to History* (New York: Columbia U. Press, 1940). The contribution of science to historical understanding forms the basis for "Science and History," in Robert B. Lindsay, *The Role of Science in Civilization* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963). Certain reservations about the interdisciplinary approach are expressed by Harold T. Parker, "A Tentative Reflection on the Interdisciplinary Approach and the Historian," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LVI (1957), 105-111.

Essays concerned with the importance of studying history that transcends national boundaries include: Geoffrey Barraclough, "Universal History," in H.P.R. Finberg, ed., *Approaches to History: A Symposium* (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1962), 83-109; Joseph R. Strayer, "United States and World History," *Journal of General Education*, II (January, 1948), 144-148; and Theodore D. Lockwood, "History and the Humanities," *Journal of Higher Education*, XXVIII (January, 1957), 1-9. The fact that history depends on the viewer as well as the viewed is elucidated in Gerhard Masur, "Distinctive Traits of Western Civilization:Through the Eyes of Western Historians," *American Historical Review*, LXVII (April,1962), 591-608. Of particular value to teachers of civilization who must generalize is the Gottschalk study (above).

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE TRANSCRIPT

* * *

The pagination of Appendix A reverts to 1,2,3 ff., because this transcript was printed and bound separately for the conference consultants and other interested authorities. Appendix B, resuming the actual pagination, begins on page 149.

1903

THE IMPROVEMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY COURSES IN THE HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION

* * *

Transcript of

A DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE

under the auspices of

The Curriculum Improvement Program
Cooperative Research Branch
United States Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.
and
The Department of History
Western Michigan University

June 15-17, 1964, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Mich.

* * *

Edited by Paul L. Maier, with
the assistance of Dale Pattison, Willis
F. Dunbar, Robert Hahn, and Charles R.
Starring

CONTENTS

Welcoming and Introductions.. 1

Explanation of the Project... 5

"The History of History of Civilization Courses"
Prof. Dexter Perkins... 7

"Values of the Course -- Real or Imaginary?"
Prof. Geoffrey Bruun... 11

"The 'Ideal' History of Civilization Course"
Prof. T. Walter Wallbank... 19

"The History of Man -- What Can and Should be Covered"
Prof. Joseph R. Strayer.. 28
Prof. Goldwin Smith.. 31
Prof. Russell B. Thomas.. 32

"Involvement of the non-Western World"
Prof. Claude A. Buss... 37

Analysis of Deficiencies in History of Civilization Courses
Prof. Alfred H. Kelly.. 43
Prof. Eric W. Cochrane... 47
Prof. Richard E. Sullivan.. 51
Prof. John L. Snell.. 54

Civilization Courses in the Junior College
Dr. Roger H. Van Bolt.. 61

"History of Civilization Courses Outside the United States"
Prof. Alastair M. Taylor... 68

"Is Special Preparation for Instructors in History of Civilization Desirable?"
Dean Robert J. Schaefer.. 75

Discussion of Guidelines for a Contemplated National Research Project to Seek the Improvement of Courses in the History of Civilization.. 88

Concluding Statements.. 111

Prof. Paul L. Maier: Welcome to our conference, Gentlemen! We are more than pleased that you could find room in your crowded schedules to attend our conclave, which I think testifies to its importance. -- Someone saw our list of participants and observed that we had assembled not just one or two stars here, but a veritable galaxy. We are happy indeed that you are here.

I first introduce Dr. James W. Miller, President of Western Michigan University.

Dr. James W. Miller: Historians: It is my pleasure and privilege to welcome you to Western Michigan University. I note that there will be additional welcomes from my colleagues; therefore I will confine myself to making only a remark or two. It is extremely pleasing to see this concentration of effort, money, and time being given to one of the humanities, an area in which I am convinced we can do much more to excite the minds of our students. There has been considerable demonstration of this fact on this campus in recent years.

As an administrator, I have a very special interest in this conference because as we, as an institution, grow larger and larger we have a real problem as to how we can best organize our resources at the university level in such a way that we assure ourselves of qualitative growth during this period of inevitable quantitative growth. Qualitative growth requires constant evaluation and re-evaluation of what we are currently doing. If I may inject a personal note, I think one of the most valuable experiences I had during my time in the armed services was to reflect on the fantail of a small ship about life in general and more specifically, what I had been doing with my life to date and what I might hope to do with it in the future. One fine consequence of all of this was that when I returned from the service, I immediately took to the city dump a tremendously large supply of scientifically verified, so-called objective, multiple-choice, and reverse multiple-choice items. Over one thousand of these previously treasured exam items were burned, and that was the beginning, as far as I am concerned, of the reformation in at least one teacher. The emphasis on spewing out factual information in an environment in which every fact is considered free and equal with every other fact has, in my opinion, done more damage to the educational process than any other single emphasis. Serious consideration needs to be given as to how you reach the students' minds to the point that you excite them about the learning process. I am firmly convinced that you do not do it by multiple-choice or reverse multiple-choice items. Nor do I think that you do it with techniques of television or any other mechanized gadgetry. While the new media have their place in the classroom, they can never substitute for the master teacher. It is my belief that we really do not teach anyone. Rather, I think that we excite our students, we guide them, we encourage them, and this is the sum and substance of our work.

We are delighted that you are here on our campus to review and evaluate courses given in the history of civilization, and we wish you well as you work toward your goal of formulating programs of study calculated to excite youngsters and hopefully to produce a revolution in the moral, spiritual, aesthetic, and intellectual areas as significant as the technical revolution which has already been wrought. -- Good wishes, and thank you.

Prof. Maier: Thank you very much, President Miller. -- Our Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Russell Seibert, has an even "higher" calling. He is a historian and his specialty is the eighteenth century. Dr. Seibert.

Dr. Russell H. Seibert: Dr. Maier, President Miller, and distinguished scholars: I shouldn't begin by saying that I think this conference is being held a quarter of a century too late, but I would like to say that I wish this particular conference had been held a quarter of a century earlier. At that time this particular institution went through a rather major curricular revision or revolution. I was fairly new on the staff then, and a committee suggested that I teach a course that was to be entitled the "Foundations of Western Civilization." Since I was the youngest member on the history staff and had the courage of youth, I said that I would be willing to undertake it. Somewhere in our archives can be found a report that I wrote to the committee at the end of the first year, in which I said that this was an impossible course for anyone to teach and strongly recommended that it be done away with and be forgotten about. I now am convinced that the committee was much wiser than I, because it said, "Well, we think you ought to give it a second try." So I taught it for the second year and at the end of the second year I wasn't sure whether it was a good course or a bad course, because even then I was suffering from the deficiencies that I know you are going to consider in this conference. I was overwhelmed by the amount of material that had to be touched upon in one way or another. My own knowledge of this vast panorama of human history was very spotty. I remember how pleased I was when we got to the eighteenth century and certain other areas that I thought I knew something about, and how horrified I was covering other areas about which I had the feeling I knew nothing. I didn't know what to emphasize, and to me good teaching is almost entirely a matter of proper emphasis. I wasn't sure what the goals of the course should be. I guess I wouldn't have known whether it was a course in humanities or a course in the social sciences. I didn't know whether I was supposed to get these students filled with a large amount of somewhat indigestible facts, or whether they were to emerge truly educated people, having traveled with me from the age of pre-civilization up to the present. Nevertheless, I was instructed to try it for a third year. At the end of that year I had become very enthusiastic about the course. I became a crusader in favor of throwing out what had for years been the basic course in history and making the Foundations of Western Civilization the basic course. In time it became a part of what we call our basic studies program here at Western Michigan University.

I never felt fully competent to teach the course, but I was always thrilled by the opportunity of stretching the mental horizons of incoming freshmen and introducing them to a number of ideas and concepts in areas about which they had never before given any thought. I feel that anyone who has been associated with a course of this sort over the years finds that it can make a tremendous impact upon students despite the weaknesses, the defects, and the deficiencies that we know do exist. We are still faced with many of the problems that you and I and many others were confronted with a quarter of a century ago. So all I can say is that I am delighted this meeting is being held. I wish I could have personally profited from its findings a quarter of a century ago, but I feel that there are much larger numbers of young instructors struggling with these same problems today, and any good that can come from this conference will be of tremendous help to them and to their students.

Prof. Maier: Thanks very much, Dr. Seibert. -- The germinal idea for a history of civilization project is attributable to the Head of our History Department, Dr. Willis Dunbar, who will extend our final welcome.

Dr. Willis F. Dunbar: Participants in the conference and members of the audience, we are very, very happy to have you all here, and I hope that these two or three days in Kalamazoo will be profitable to you. I know they will be to us.

I think I should take just a moment to explain one thing that Dr. Seibert said. For a long time, the course here was called Foundations of Western Civilization. We now call it World Civilizations. Back in the days when it was called Foundations, and usually referred to as Foundations, a young instructor was passing out class cards on registration day. Our booth was located next to the home economics table. A young woman came up and stood halfway between the tables and said, "Do you have Foundations?", and this fellow replied, "Do you want garments or civilizations?" (Laughter)

I think that of all of the distinguished participants that we have managed to attract to this conference, I should pay particular tribute to Prof. Perkins and Prof. Snell, because I believe that the inspiration for this conference arose indirectly from the book which they produced: The Education of Historians in the United States. When this book was published, we at Western Michigan University were in the midst of a move in several of the departments toward the formulation of a program leading to the doctorate. At the present time we do have a Graduate School, which offers a master's degree in several departments, including history. We also offer a program, somewhat beyond the master's degree but not to the doctoral level, in Education. This is a very rapidly growing university, and there has been a strong feeling on the part of both our alumni and our students that we should go on and offer terminal-degree work in different departments. And so this was under consideration. Well, after we had perused the book which I referred to a moment ago, authored by Professors Perkins and Snell, we came to the conclusion that it would probably be a mistake at this time for our History Department to undertake to secure library and other facilities which would be needed if we cared todo a respectable job on a terminal degree program leading to the Ph.D. in history. We were impressed by the fact that this book revealed that there were over eighty institutions already offering the Ph.D. in history, that many of these institutions had room for a great many more students than they had, and that many of the newer ones granted very few Ph.D. degrees in history. It seemed to us that it would be a useless expenditure for the taxpayers of the State of Michigan to set up a terminal degree program in history here. But that led us to inquire, "Is there anything else that we can do?" It seemed to us that one of the most important problems faced by historians involved the freshman course in the history of civilization, and the education of instructors in this course.

I'm sure all of us are aware that the provision of adequately prepared instructors in history of civilization courses is a problem in many parts of the country. A questionnaire which we sent out -- I think Dr. Maier will explain it to you in more detail -- showed a widespread feeling that our present method of preparing instructors to teach this course in colleges and universities leaves a great deal to be desired.

Well, then the question arose as to whether here at Western, through the cooperation of other departments, we could design a course of study that would more effectively prepare teachers of civilization courses. Would instructors, with this specialized preparation, have any status in the academic profession? What sort of a program could be provided for the preparation of such instructors? All of these were questions for which we had no adequate answers, and so we applied to the Office of Education, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for assistance in at least developing this study. That brings us to the conference which we are holding today.

We have a very deep interest in this course at Western. About fifty-five percent of our students take it the freshman year, and many of us teach this course. We are interested in this conference, however, far beyond its significance for our own campus, because no one, as far as we know, has ever probed this subject in depth. This kind of study would prove useful not only to this institution but to many other institutions across the country. Our minds are completely open. It may be the verdict of this conference that no such program is practicable or possible; if so, that's what we want to know. If it isn't so, then how can we better prepare instructors for this course? Is it practicable to offer a course not directly associated with any one discipline? Would the people so prepared be able to obtain positions in good institutions? These are some of the issues, and we hope you will be able to help answer these questions, or at least to guide us in some sort of a program that will provide the answers.

Prof. Maier: Thank you very much, Dr. Dunbar. -- We would like to introduce the various conference participants. I have allotted only one book to each of you, because you have authored so many others that if we gave a complete bibliography, I fear the introductions would extend past lunch time.

Beginning on our right -- and the rationale for seating has been solely and unimaginatively alphabetical -- Prof. Geoffrey Bruun, formerly of Cornell, is now visiting professor at the University of Illinois and author of the famous text, along with Wallace Ferguson: European Civilization.

Prof. Claude A. Buss, of Stanford University, is visiting professor at the National War College in Washington, D.C., and author of the just-published Asia in the Modern World.

Prof. Eric W. Cochrane is Head of the College history staff, which teaches this course at the University of Chicago.

Prof. Alfred H. Kelly, Chairman of the Department of History at Wayne State University in Detroit, is author of The American Constitution and, of course, other writings.

Prof. Dexter Perkins, of the University of Rochester, is past President of the American Historical Association. He was Head of the History Department at Rochester for many years and is author of numerous books on American History. He is also co-author of The Education of Historians in the United States, the book to which Prof. Dunbar just referred.

Prof. Robert J. Schaefer, Dean of Columbia Teachers College, is our authority on educational methodology and pedagogy.

Prof. Goldwin Smith, Wayne State University, is, of course, the author of The Heritage of Man.

Prof. Dale P. Pattison is Assistant Director of this project, and you have already met Vice-President Seibert, President Miller, and Dr. Dunbar.

Prof. John L. Snell, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of History at Tulane University, was director of the American Historical Association study which led, among other things, to the book which he co-authored with Dr. Perkins, The Education of Historians in the United States.

Prof. Joseph R. Strayer, of Princeton University, is author -- along with Professors Gatzke and Harbison -- of The Course of Civilization.

Prof. Richard E. Sullivan, of Michigan State University's History Department, is author of A Short History of Western Civilization.

Dr. Robert F. Sullivan is Associate Director of the North Central Association. We thought it would be important to have representation from this agency from the point of view of accreditation problems.

Prof. Alastair M. Taylor, of Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, will describe how history of civilization courses are taught outside the United States, particularly in the British tradition. He is, as you know, the co-author of Civilization Past and Present.

Prof. Russell B. Thomas, of the Department of Humanities at the University of Chicago, is an authority on general education and basic studies, the department under which the civilization course is taught in many universities, including our own. He wrote In Search for a Common Learning, among other books.

Dr. Roger H. Van Bolt is our representative for junior or community colleges, where this course has particular significance, special problems, and challenges.

Prof. T. Walter Wallbank, of the University of Southern California, is co-author of Civilization Past and Present, and certainly one of the pioneers in the history of civilization texts.

Then, Professors Robert Hahn and Gilbert Morell of our History Department, are additional members of the project, along with Prof. Charles Starring, who couldn't be here today.

Gentlemen, again we express our extreme pleasure in having you here. We must frankly confess that up to now many of you had been just books to us, and so we are happy that you turned out to be human beings after all! (Laughter) -- I trust you all have the proposed agenda before you. We welcome suggestions from the floor for any emendations.

I believe you are already familiar with the materials which were sent to you, so we need not at this time give a long apologia for this conference. You would agree, I think, that history of civilization courses are fundamentally important to a liberal arts curriculum. In some cases, they provide the only taste of history for many college students. In other instances, these panoramas of the past offer such an attraction that unsuspecting students become incipient history majors. But in all cases, I think, civilization courses present a capsulized university education in themselves, because what other college course offers "mankind with the original cast?"

In many universities, history of civilization courses have done magnificently. I would imagine that most of the institutions represented here have very successful programs. This is also the case at Western Michigan University; we have had much success with our course. However, I believe you would agree that this is not a universal experience. In many institutions, history of civilization has not been an effective course, and even in those schools where it has met with some success, there is room for revision. Our questionnaire showed that, nationally, much improvement is needed. The difficulties were listed in some instances. Instructors complain about having to conduct the student all the way from Adam to Atom, literally, in two semesters. Wrong solutions to meet this problem have been devised: starting the course at 1648 A.D., for example, and by-passing the ancient and medieval world. (I'm an ancient historian so I feel particularly sensitive in this area!) Students complain about the difficulty in mastering the mass of material presented them, while they regularly miss the forest of history for the trees of factual data. Department heads grumble about the course: in some institutions, it does not enjoy a very high reputation. One department chairman referred to it as a kind of purgatory for new instructors, where they must first prove themselves before winning the privilege of teaching advanced courses. Instructors have been faulted for not having enough background in the history-related disciplines, and even within their field they are specialists only in the French Revolution, for example, or in a particular century. A full panorama is sadly lacking. -- What about the non-Western world? Should it be included in this course? How much of the East should be included, or should a separate course be devised for it? These are a few of the problems and the issues -- there are many more -- hence this conference.

We are very pleased that the Office of Education, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, shared our concern as to the need for this project. When I first broached it in Washington to Dr. William Wolf, his immediate reaction was that the need for such a study was so obvious that it must have been done before now. So he quickly checked his files, but found nothing. Dr. Wolf reported the way in which his own history of civilization course had been taught: the professor opened the textbook and read about every third sentence verbatim. The students simply underlined the respective sentences in their texts and that was it! Now, I think you would agree that this is a pretty grim teaching method, although some of you are authors of those very textbooks, and perhaps you think it an excellent way! (Laughter)

Are there any questions from the group as to the conduct of the conference, or any suggestions about how we may alter our proposed agenda? If not, we will proceed to a presentation by Prof. Dexter Perkins on "The History of History of Civilizations Courses." (Perhaps we can agree that "history of civilization" is a least-common-denominator title for the introductory college history course which has such a wide variety of names.) As good historians, how could we begin anything without discussing the history of it first? Prof. Perkins.

Prof. Dexter Perkins: Well, I am not sure that I am an authority on the subject, but I do have some ideas to present. Of course, I have experience in many years of teaching, during a great part of which I have taught such a course, or been concerned with it, or have been concerned with the instruction of graduate students who might sometime have to teach it.

Now, just to be historical for a moment in a literal sense, we now wonder what has happened to the college curriculum over the long pull. Originally, of course, we go back to the middle of the nineteenth century into the highly rigid curriculum. Then the rigidities began to break down, and at Harvard in 1869 with the advent of President Eliot, of course, there came to be a greater and greater freedom of electives. When I went through there was elective anarchy; you could take anything you wanted to take and the choices were sometimes somewhat bizarre, to put it mildly. As a reaction against this, as you all know, the idea of distribution and concentration came into the picture. The idea, I think, owes a great deal to Woodrow Wilson, the idea that there must be a broad kind of training and a training in some special discipline, and this is what we have called general education for many years. It is an idea which has spread and has been widely accepted. It formed a basis, as you all know, of a very important study at Harvard and is indeed the basis for the curriculum at Harvard at the present time.

I really will have to talk to you in terms of my personal experience, but before I do that I do want to raise the question of what we mean when we talk about general education. This is a large and mouth-filling phrase, and it needs to be defined. I don't suppose any of us who have ever taught a general course, or who have taught history, fail to know that, outside the persons we stimulate to go on in our own discipline, a very large part of what we say will be forgotten. If we examined our students twenty years after with regard to the election of 1860, the results would probably be somewhat embarrassing, or with regard to any other particular set of facts. What I have said many times, of course, in my career is that we have to depend more than we always realize on the imponderables, on the intangibles with regard to education. Now the intangibles in the field of general education, I think, deserve to be particularly emphasized.

One of the most important things to learn, for human beings, is a sense of process; that the world is not the same from generation to generation, that it changes. There are, of course, some individuals who never recognize the fact, and we have them amongst us even in 1964, but we all know that one thing we can accomplish is to give the student a feeling that the world was different in the past and will be different in the future; and if we can move easily in the realm of political, economic, or intellectual change, or if we can teach others the world of political, economic, or intellectual change, we will have performed, I think, a fundamental service. This to my mind is one of the core values of the course in Western civilization. While the facts will be forgotten -- whole gaps forgotten -- it will still be true for the student who is sensitive to all the values of such a course that he understand the process of change.

I have noted here a second value which I feel is very important and which again a course in Western civilization can now provide, and that is the sense of beauty. A course in Western civilization will inevitably deal with periods of artistic efflorescence in ancient Greece, if you will, in Renaissance Italy, and in many other periods. Surely in the frame of our civilization we need to fortify the sense of appreciation of beauty, of reverence for beauty, and of understanding of the aesthetic impulse of man.

And then the third value which can hardly be exaggerated in significance in the time in which we live is, of course, a sense of the role of science. In this portentously scientific age, in this age in which science sometimes seems to be the master and not the slave or servant of mankind, we need to put science into a broad perspective. Again, it would appear to me that a course in Western civilization could do this job more adequately than almost any other course I can imagine.

These are some of the values. I am not speaking for the moment of what I shall refer to a little later as the value of such a course in the general preparation of the teachers of history. I believe -- and again you will find nothing novel in my views if you have ever read anything I wrote -- that we become obsessed with detail in our profession and that the larger values need to be enforced and re-enforced and reiterated if we are to be the useful servants of our profession.

Now, these are very general observations. I think it ought to be said that these forces are now pretty well rooted in the American curriculum. It will be very difficult to uproot them, assuming it would be desirable, which of course I am not assuming. Therefore, the questions that you have raised seem to me the broadest possible questions; the question, that is, of how to improve the courses. We are not going to find them abandoned, but they can become routine, they can become dead. From that point of view it seems to me a conference of this kind has a very great practical utility. I think for all those who are going on in the profession, this course has a great utility, for reasons that I will indicate a little later. Now, my experience with this course runs through three periods. I was Chairman of the Department at the University of Rochester from 1925 to 1933. At the very beginning of my chairmanship I accepted a course already provided in Western civilization, and I found for it two dedicated teachers. To them this was their great contribution, their fundamental and central contribution, as perhaps Dr. Seibert has indicated. One of them after twenty years died at a relatively early age, and the other, Prof. Arthur J. May, taught this course for over thirty years. It did not prevent him from cultivating some field intensively. There is no contradiction between giving a general course and a specialized course for a teacher of history. Indeed, I believe that the general course liberates the mind, and by forcing the teacher to carry on a process of selection in a great mass of data it prepares him better for the exposition of a relatively narrow field. That course in the long years that it was given at Rochester, and it is still given at Rochester, was, I think we may fairly say, a sensational success. One year I remember we had -- our university was relatively small -- possibly twelve hundred students in the early period. One year all the girls elected to Phi Beta Kappa had concentrated in history, and a substantial proportion of the men. Almost every year we sent people on. By the way, I want to pay a word of memory and tribute to a great teacher who gave this course at Amherst, my colleague for ten years at Rochester, Prof. Packard. Prof. Packard sent from that course at Amherst more students to graduate school than any teacher I know from any college, and he did it by virtue of the inspiration which he provided in History 12.

A short time ago, I attended a dinner at the University of Rochester in honor of Prof. May. Some five hundred students came from all over the country to pay tribute to him after his thirty-five years of teaching. This emphasizes a fundamental and central fact: that a course in the history of Western civilization, like any other course, will be no better than the teacher who teaches it, who can arouse enthusiasm, and who feels a sense of dedication to his students.

What bothers me very much about academic life in general is the relative indifference of the younger-generation instructors to the student himself. They become so obsessed with research that the human contacts which are the very heart of the educational process are lost sight of. If this kind of course is taught in a lackadaisical way by an individual who regards it as an unpleasant addition to his other duties, or as something that is quite unconquerable anyway and therefore he better not mess about with it, of course it will not be well done. So the problem here is the problem, as I have said, of finding the individuals, and this is of genuine importance from every point of view.

Here is where I begin to deal with my personal contact with the course. These men I regard with peculiar affection and pride. The continuity of the course was a point of great significance: I believe that, rather than pass it along from one instructor to another, if you can find a man who will commit himself to it in the deep sense of the term you will have accomplished a great deal; and I feel that I was able to do that at Rochester after I myself had ceased to teach this course.

Now the second point I would make -- and this again is from my personal experiences in the general history of the problem -- concerns our doctoral program at the University of Rochester, which we instituted in 1947. We have never had a large number of graduate students. We have attempted to be highly selective, although the number has somewhat grown. Everyone of these graduates has a chance to teach as an assistant in our general course in Western civilization. There are two points I want to emphasize in regard to their teaching. Several years ago, I made a survey of a great eastern university, and I found that the assistants in the civilization course were left completely rudderless; nobody paid any attention to them, and they had a sense of merely doing a job that was not respectable but was more potboiling than anything else. When we came to organize the assistantships in history at Rochester, we gave the graduate students a good deal of briefing before they began, and we visited them frequently. I think that by the time they had gotten through they had been fired with some of the enthusiasm that I hope my colleagues and I felt for the course and were prepared to think of it not as drudgery, but as a really exciting intellectual adventure.

There is another point I would like to make with regard to graduate students. I notice that in some universities the practice has arisen of giving fellowships without any teaching function to the best students, and then taking the next category down the line to become assistants. This to my mind is outrageous. Teaching ought to be regarded not as a means of earning money, but as a social contribution, and I think one of the things that has to be done in Western civilization courses is to make the assistantships in these courses respectable. The assistants ought to be reasonably well paid. They ought to be regarded as important as individuals. They ought to be given a keen sense of participating in an educational enterprise and not just left to stew around and mark papers, and let it go at that. We also did one thing more in our graduate program: all these boys had to lecture either in Western civilization or in some other course, and so when they completed their doctoral study at Rochester they had had experience on the platform as well as in section meetings.--These are two different techniques, of course: the technique of running a section meeting is one method; the technique of preparing a lecture is another, and most of us have practiced both techniques.--I would have hated to expose undergraduates to graduate students over a long period, but we usually had them lecture two or three times. They gave ten lectures in one of the years of their graduate program. If they didn't do a good job, we would see to it that the next lecture was better by going over with them their method of presentation. The problem of teaching this course is the problem of teaching in general: that is, to make the young men who are preparing for the Doctor's degree interested in teaching.

Now comes the third stage of my experience with this problem. You know that I was President of the American Historical Association in 1956, and that I spoke on the subject of teaching. Shortly thereafter, the Carnegie Corporation gave us fifty thousand dollars for a survey of the teaching of history. I want to pay tribute to the very great services performed by Prof. Snell in connection with this enterprise. We had, as you know, a very distinguished committee, and we drew up a report with which I am delighted to see you are familiar. Now this report is the third step in my own evolution regarding this problem. What I profoundly hope will happen to the graduate schools is that they will pay some heed to what we have said about the necessity of preparing teachers in the broad sense of the word, and not merely preparing specialists who know only a very small segment of the historical scene.

This therefore brings us to the question that is connected with this conference. I think the core problem, as I say, is to develop on the undergraduate level a greater respect for teaching and a demand that it be effective in human terms. Now this is not merely a problem of the graduate school. It is a problem for the institutions which hire the products of the graduate school, and again and again I was surprised to find that very few inquiries are often made in regard to the teaching capacity of the individual. The graduate departments in the institutions themselves can not often evaluate the teacher whom they are recommending. I have had some appalling recommendations in the course of my career, from that point of view, instructors whose capacity to communicate was something less than electric. So I think we have a problem there in asking about these people, in finding out whether they can teach before we hire them.

I would like to say one word more about teaching. This is not only a question of preparing people for effective teaching, but it is a question of the prestige of teaching. We recommended in our report many expedients to improve teaching, and I am not going to bother you with the details now. I know that the number of institutions which award a prize of some kind, some kind of academic recognition for teaching, has been growing. I think this is effective in calling attention to the fundamental importance of teaching.

There are two problems on which I would like an additional word. I feel that in general it is not desirable to segment a course of this kind; that is, I lean to the view that someone should teach it all. If it is divided up among a dozen men, they are likely to bring the specialist point of view into the individual period which they will represent. I think we should always bear in mind that this is an enterprise which has a kind of unity of its own. Now this may not necessarily be the case, but I have felt, as I remarked a little earlier, that we were fortunate at Rochester to have two people who gave themselves with such dedication to the program, and I think that such people can be found.--The other problem that is bound to rise, as was indicated by Prof. Maier, is the question of where you start. If you are going to talk about Western civilization, where does it end? My way of answering that question, for what it is worth, is that you do start with the West. Possibly toward the end you have to say something about the effect of the West on the societies that lie beyond. I am more and more impressed with the very interesting times in which we live, with the growing unity of the West and the complexity of those areas which are not Western; and I do not think that you can do more than suggest the impact of the West on other societies in a general course of this kind. This in no way depreciates the value of a course in the study of other areas, but it seems to me you have to stop somewhere in dealing with a program as ambitious as a general course is.

Well, I think those are probably the points I want to make. I offer them to you as a basis for further study.

Prof. Maier: That was a fine keynote, Prof. Perkins, and it should certainly lead to animated discussion.

I thought that because of the inner unity between the first two presentations, we might proceed directly to Prof. Bruun and then open our discussion. Prof. Bruun will comment on the topic: "Values of the History of Civilization Course--Real or Imaginary?"

Prof. Geoffrey Bruun: I have already assured the Project Director that I would speak briefly, and I am glad I did so because Prof. Perkins' talk has covered nearly all the points I might have brought out in favor of the course and its real values. On the question of values, real or imaginary, I am taking the affirmative standpoint: that they are real. The points already mentioned are the points that I was going to touch on and I will just re-affirm them.

The values seem to me to be three-fold. I don't see how a student can acquire a sense of time, a time-bridge, if you will, for the last five thousand years unless he studies history, and I don't think he can acquire it in any other general courses as well as he can in a general survey of civilizations course. I would add that I think it should tie in with other civilizations, giving the student some idea where they fit in and where they connect up with Western civilization. So the first value that I would emphasize is giving the student a sense of five thousand years of history and the relationship of the great movements and the great advances in that five thousand years. I don't see how you can place events unless you have acquired that sense of continuity. I would stress that the learning process, as we know, is not a matter of assimilation of facts; it is a matter of organizing those facts in the mind in some kind of a relationship in order to retrieve them as needed. The learning process is that two-fold assimilation and retrieval. I think that the time-bridge, the organizing of knowledge in terms of a historical perspective, plays a vital part.

The second point I would stress is that the civilization course is best, perhaps, for its liaison value. We have, I think, in our curriculum too many bricks and too little mortar. A general history course can give the student a bridge to his other subjects and he needs that bridge. There is too little inter-relationship, too little cohesion in his studies. Some years ago, Goldwin Smith and I had the opportunity to defend the world history course, and we emphasized the point just made by Prof. Perkins: the need to take in more of technology and science. We noted that the Western civilization course gave us plenty of art and a good deal on literature, but it omitted the technological inventions and processes that speeded history. We pointed out that technology, especially during the European Middle Ages, is the most consistent thread on which you might organize those rather chaotic centuries. So I would stress the introduction of more technology and science; particularly because (and again Prof. Perkins has anticipated this point) we have this problem of two cultures. The history of civilization course is perhaps the course best fitted to serve as a meeting ground. There, at least, C.P. Snow's "two cultures" can meet on terms of equality, and their values can be affirmed with complete impartiality.

My next point is somewhat unorthodox, perhaps. I know that the broad general courses are under criticism. We will hear, I think, Prof. Snell say that it is practically impossible to make up a good broad history of civilization and that such courses should be taught in high school. The problem here is a problem of selection and emphasis. I believe that we can have a broad survey course if it is selected with a goal in mind and aims in mind. I think the difficulty is very largely that we have had rather hazy goals and aims and nothing clear about the purpose of the course.

My last point is a brief one. I will suggest that we need to de-parochialize the student and that the world history course is the best way to do this. American college students need to learn about China, about India, about alien civilizations and ancient cultures. The best way for them to study these subjects is in a general civilization course. Those are my points; as I say, they are repetitious so I won't emphasize them further, but I would stress very much that I agree on almost every point with Prof. Perkins and feel that he has presented the issues much better than I could have done, and I want to thank him for that. Thank you.

Dr. Maier: Thank you, Prof. Bruun. -- We have an interesting exchange of opinion here on the place of the non-Western world in this course. But this will be subject to further discussion this afternoon.

Now the floor is open for discussion and any reaction whatever to the presentations by Prof. Perkins and Prof. Bruun.

Prof. Claude A. Buss: It would seem to me that at the beginning of your project here that the history of the history of civilization would be a very important part of your research effort. I would like very much to hear Prof. Perkins' elucidation of the history of the history of civilization course at Rochester. Where did it fit in your general curriculum?

Prof. Perkins: It was purely a matter of the two professors to whom I referred. They evolved it. We talked about it, but they had their own ideas. I didn't direct it.

Prof. T. Walter Wallbank: I think, Mr. Chairman, we should not be too defensive about the imperfections and frailties of these general courses. I know there is a great deal of criticism. I think sometimes, shall I call them antagonists, are so amazed at what we do that they really feel there must be something wrong with the course. I know at the University of Southern California we have made some slight adjustments and there are still cries of pain about new types of courses that we have introduced. After all, what is the standard of accomplishment in what we do? I really think that we have been doing so much that we should not be too inclined to accept all of the criticism that has been leveled against us. I am not saying, of course, that criticism is not appropriate; we can always improve. But I think the specialistic mind, if I can refer to that, believes that because you deal with large configurations and patterns that there is something undesirable about the attempt to understand and interpret large movements. They walk so meticulously and picayunishly through the maze of historical minutiae that they become attached to that point of view.

Prof. Joseph R. Strayer: I would like to switch to this question of teachers in the course. In one place I agree very much with my friend, Prof. Perkins, and in other places I disagree thoroughly. I'll take up the disagreement first so I can end on a pleasant note. My disagreement is in having the course given for a very long time by one man or two men. Now I didn't quite approach Prof. Perkins' record as chairman, but I was a chairman for twenty years, and I had an idea that it is bad for anybody to give any course for more than ten years. I must say that I did not succeed in convincing my colleagues that this was a good move, but we did manage to get a certain amount of shifts. I think this is especially true in the history of civilization course. Certainly a rapid turnover is bad; we can all agree on that. As for my own experience, I started my teaching career teaching this course, and then I didn't teach it for a good many years, and now I am winding up my career teaching it. My experience is that the first year, as Dr. Seibert said, you feel lost. The second year you begin to feel that you are getting somewhere. Maybe about the fifth year you have gained a great deal from the course. I find I get some of my best ideas in lecturing in a course of that sort. But then when you have reached this peak--and I think this is true of many courses but especially of history of civilization--it's probably just as well to let somebody else take it and get the benefits. We shouldn't be selfish about this; because it does so much good, let's not hog it. Go off and let your mind wander and study some other things, pick up some other information. Then if you come back to it, as I did, you find that you will do a different job and perhaps a better job. There are other men who have ideas who will be saying, this old fuddy-duddy has been giving the course so many years, why in the world doesn't he give me a chance? The other fellows ought to be given a chance. So I would suggest a certain turnover and let a man teach it a minimum of five years--I agree it wouldn't be any good if he doesn't take it that long--but probably not more than ten.

Now, the other thing I wanted to stress is this business of getting graduate students ready to teach in broad general courses, whether they are history of civilization or whatever they are, because the average graduate student when he has his first teaching job is not going to go into his specialty at once. There is always some senior man who has that pinned down. The device we found that works very well and which meets one of Prof. Perkins' problems is to get special permission from the Dean of our Graduate School to allow the men who have our best fellowships to teach two or three hours a week. This does not interfere greatly with their work; in fact, many of them find it rather pleasant. There are very few men who can sit and read steadily ten hours a day for six days a week. They find teaching a nice break in their other activities. They also find it is rather instructive to them, showing the sense of some of the special works that they have been reading. If you keep the teaching load down to two or three hours you are not, according to the ruling of our dean, interfering with the purpose of the fellowship. When you give a man six hours teaching or, God help us, twelve hours teaching, which is done in some places, you do definitely interfere with his work. This small amount of teaching is also easier to police, easier to watch the man. You don't have each man giving so many hours that you feel he is tired and that you may have struck him on a bad day. We also have found that practice in lecturing is helpful. We have too many graduate students to turn them loose on our undergraduates. What we do is to get the group of second- and third-year men together and let them lecture to each other. This can elicit some of the most cutting criticisms that I have ever heard. What one graduate student will say to another is far more severe than I would ever dare say. So I think we can do a good deal on the teaching job if we simply recognize the fact that this is why we exist, why we have our jobs, and that therefore it is a pretty good idea to let the graduate student find this out at a reasonably early stage in his career.

Prof. Maier: I am glad to see the discussion venture also into the area of the teaching of history in general. I think this will be one of the very important by-products of this conference.

Prof. Richard E. Sullivan: Prof. Brunn, when you mentioned that you thought the course suffered from hazy goals--I believe that was the expression you used--are you thinking in terms of the individual instructor of the course or some pre-defined goals that would hold for a large number of people involved in one of these history of civilization courses?

Prof. Brunn: I was thinking in terms of goals and aims. There is no subject on which I get more variety of answers than when I ask the instructors and professors in charge of this course what the intent of the course is. They fall back on, "Well, this is the way we teach it," which is, of course, not an answer. Then I ask the question, "Do you tie in with the other basic courses the student is taking?", and as a rule the answer is, "Well, no." You will find that the student is reading Machiavelli's Prince in a course on government, possibly, and yet the history course takes no account of that and it is never mentioned in the lecture. When I spoke of the liaison value of the general history course, I meant that you could reach out a friendly hand to several of the disciplines and try to discover what they were teaching. Perhaps we might ask the people in biology, "Would you like us to name six biologists? Would it help you if we place them in historical terms?" The same with mathematicians, perhaps. But that doesn't seem to be done. When I said "with lack of aim," I meant that the civilization course seems to be taught almost in a vacuum. What we need are more clues to help make it useful to the student, the faculty, and the teacher. That was roughly my thought.

Prof. Sullivan*: I thought you were talking in terms of some kind of defined goals for the course. I'm thinking especially of a course taught by a large number of instructors. To insist on specified aims could be the most stultifying part of the course. It might be much more profitable to think in terms of letting each individual shape the course to his own needs.

Prof. Bruun: Oh, I thoroughly agree, because if you describe the course to be taught you kill the initiative of the instructor who is giving it.

Prof. Sullivan: I think this happens more often than we realize, especially in institutions where large numbers of students are enrolled in the course.

Prof. Eric Cochrane: It seems to me so far we have been treating the question of courses of this nature from three particular points of view: that is, from the point of view of the instructor; from the point of view of a future instructor--that is, a graduate student; and from the point of view of the undergraduate who is going through the course. I would like to comment on all three, but I won't now because there isn't time. But I dare say all these things will be considered in the course of our discussions.

From the point of view of the instructor, I would like to underline once again what Mr. Perkins said concerning the value of such a course or a general history course to the instructor even if he is largely engaged in specialized research in one particular field. I would add from my own particular experience my conviction that occasional contact with the current literature in other fields of history, and a somewhat more frequent contact with the documents of the fields of history in antiquity and in modern times, has been of considerable assistance to me in posing problems for myself and in understanding the particular circumstances of my own rather small specialty. With all due respect to Mr. Perkins, my field is the Italian Renaissance; but it is more especially the Italian Renaissance, not from 1450 to 1480, but from 1527 to about 1588. (Laughter) Nevertheless, it is always a great help to me to read Cicero, and also each year to read a couple of the latest monographs in ancient history or in the more recent periods, that are provided me by my colleagues in the general course. Otherwise I don't think I would have time to read works of history that don't immediately concern my particular field of specialization. This is one point that I dare say should be developed later on in the course of our discussion. The other, the one I would like to speak about for just a moment, is that concerning the use of graduate assistants in the teaching of such a course. I'm afraid I'm limited in extent by my own experience, because the word graduate assistant is anathema at the University of Chicago. Don't think that there aren't people at the University of Chicago who would not love to have their graduate students teaching in the undergraduate college; but since we have the advantage of an undergraduate college that is small and rather high-powered, the college administration will not even hear of such an affair, and all of our instruction even in the most basic courses is given by full members of the faculty. I really think there is an advantage in spite of the peculiarities of our own situation to experimenting with this particular solution rather than using graduate assistants. I'm rather afraid very often that graduate assistants--and I think it is well that the objection has been raised elsewhere--are quite justly more concerned about the prospects of getting a Ph.D. degree as rapidly as possible than they are about teaching. This is from the point of view of the future instructor. But from the point of view of the undergraduate I wonder if we can morally justify the use of our own undergraduates as guinea pigs upon which we thrust our future teachers. I realize it is almost an insult to your problem--one that has been made perfectly clear by the famous book we have all been referring to, The Education of Historians in the United States. The main question is how we can fit some sort of instruction about pedagogy into our graduate curriculum, how we as trainers of graduate students can in some way prepare them for the career for which they are at least partially destined; and I'll admit this is a terribly grave problem. We at the University of Chicago tend to solve this in a rather dishonest way--here I am airing my dirty linen. We do not permit our graduate students to teach at the University of Chicago, because we feel that the tuition students have to pay really warrants their being taught by the best members of the faculty. Yet, unfortunately, we do very often send our graduate students who need a little bit of extra money over to Roosevelt and various other institutions in the City of Chicago. While I am appealing to our sense of honor here, I must confess that we do not observe this ourselves, except in our own community. Nevertheless, this is my main point, that most of the justification that has been offered so far for involving graduate assistants in teaching is to further their skills, and I am afraid you are not taking into account the special prerequisites or the special rights of an undergraduate, who is very often making considerable sacrifice to gain what he thinks ought to be the best instruction. I doubt that the use of graduate students in this particular capacity is particularly good either for them or for the undergraduates to whom they are exposed.

---

*Hereinafter, this identifies Prof. Richard E. Sullivan, unless otherwise indicated.

Prof. Perkins: But sooner or later they have got to teach, and it disturbs me that so often a man can go "on stage" without any teaching whatsoever.

Prof. Wallbank: Prof. Perkins, hasn't the question arisen as to whether the poor teaching and experimentation should take place after a man becomes an assistant professor or whether he shouldn't be allowed to get a little experience and make his mistakes when he is a little younger?

Prof. Cochrane: May I bring up my plea once again, Mr. Perkins, on behalf of the undergraduates. Now I am quite willing to have my graduate students get teaching experience with other people's undergraduates. -- Somehow this question that I cannot answer, "How to get graduate students trained," is one that we are constantly worried about at the University of Chicago and one that we have so far not solved. But from the point of view of the undergraduates I think it is far more worthwhile for them to be exposed to the best teachers of the university or to be exposed to members of the faculty who have regular academic rank. Furthermore, from my own personal point of view, I would hate to have to yield my position in such a course, which I find intensely stimulating, to a graduate assistant.

Prof. Alfred H. Kelly: There is an analogue, isn't there, Mr. Chairman, in the dilemma which the medical profession faces? I suggest that the best solution to the problem is to be found in terms analogous to that which the medical profession uses; that is, that in the inception of the internship, the young graduate student will go out and practice on a patient, perhaps unfortunately sometimes a poor person. Nonetheless, everybody recognizes that it is better to have this student practice on a patient under the supervision of an experienced physician than to put him out without this practice and let him operate, shall we say, in the medical field at large without such training. I feel intensely the responsibilities of our department for putting people into the field with Ph.D. degrees, and lesser training as well, who have had some supervised teaching experience. They may on occasion, I will concede, do some damage to our students, but if you maintain a sense of departmental responsibility for these graduates, if you give them supervision and instruction, if you ease them gradually into the process so they, so to speak, don't perform a major operation all at once, I think you will get away with it. The internship conception is certainly not ours: I think it is Prof. Perkins' original solution to this problem.

Prof. Strayer: I would agree that you should not experiment too much on your undergraduates. On the other hand, we do experiment with them in many other ways, and I don't know that this one is going to be any harder on them than some of the things that some of the older and supposedly wiser people do. There are two rules, however, that we always apply; first, that the graduate student must have passed his general examination. I think the custom which occurs in some places of taking a first-year graduate student and putting him in as a teacher is a very dangerous one,and you get poor teaching then. On the other hand, the men who have passed their general examination may be as ready to teach then as they are ever going to be.

The other thing that we do is never to have all the instruction, all the class sections, taught by graduate students. There is always a mixture of senior and junior people, and this keeps the graduate student very much on his toes. In my course next year, I'm going to have two full professors taking sections, along with the one that I take myself. The graduate students whom we select are our best graduate students, and they are going to be teaching in competition with three of the senior men in the department. Now if that doesn't make them behave I don't know what will.

Prof. Perkins: This is an empirical matter, it seems to me. I have observed the program at Rochester over a period of years, and I don't think that undergraduate instruction by graduate students will be deficient if they are properly supervised. I think it could happen, but I never had complaints about the teaching of my graduate assistants.

Prof. Cochrane: I would yield in the matter only on the condition that we officially register as one of the values of an introductory history course of this sort, the particular service performed by the graduate department of the university in giving the teacher a certain amount of experience in teaching.

Prof. Kelly: I would like to make two observations here. The first is that it is not just the graduate students who learn about civilization; it is also the regular members of the faculty. I think I learned far more about history in teaching a course in civilization of this kind than I ever learned in graduate school from the University of Chicago History Department. (Laughter) There is far more of an ability to synthesize that derives from this course than one is likely to have learned in courses, let's say, in Constitutional History that I or some of my colleagues might be teaching.

The second observation I would like to make is related to what Prof. Strayer said. I would add to his techniques, which I think are standard and must be recognized, a third one for graduate students, what for the lack of a better word I have called the "constant bull session." That is, the process of having these people who are teaching the course -- those who have faculty status, the full professors, the director of the course -- sit down very frequently with these graduate students in a kind of informal seminar, call it what you will. What we have done at Wayne is to erect a seminar in civilization which runs right along with the course, and the graduate student who is teaching a section must take this seminar in which the professors who are also teaching sections sit with the graduate students every few days, who become indoctrinated, so to speak, excited, and exposed to the particular problems of the course. This is, I think, integral to the process of not only protecting the undergraduate, but also educating the graduates.

Prof. Maier: This graduate "civilization seminar" certainly seems to be an excellent plan.

Prof. Dunbar: One solution to this problem that is sometimes used is to have the members of the regular faculty give lectures and have graduate assistants conduct the quiz or discussion sections. The question I raise is whether actually more skill is not required to do a good job with the discussion or quiz sections than is required to give a good lecture.

Prof. Buss: At Stanford, I don't think it would be quite fair to say that our man is the teacher of the course; he is the director of the course. It is a huge operation, since every student has to take it. It is quite a job for him to marshal his forces. Those who conduct the quiz sections are hired for it and have instructional status; they are not graduate students. One of our great problems has been to make them feel a part of the faculty, because they feel there is a tremendous gap between them and the senior professors. It is something like your arrangement at Wayne: we have weekly sessions where the director of the course and the teachers get together and discuss their strategy for the next week.

Prof. Maier: Gentlemen, may I call this discussion to a close with the assurance that we will resume this topic -- the function of graduate assistants -- under the category of pedagogy. A final item, just for the record: do any of you know when the first history of civilization course was taught?

Prof. Perkins: I can't answer that, but it goes back to Columbia. Even when I was in graduate school they were talking about the course.

Prof. Wallbank: I think that 1937 was when I began to teach world civilizations. At that time, of course, Dr. Bruun's very fine survey was available for the Western strand. In world civilization, I believe that the only book available at that time was Prof. Thorndike's Short History of Civilization. Of course, we have the polemical survey of H.G. Wells, which is a very interesting contribution. -- I think that around 1937 was one of the first "world" civilization courses.

Dean Robert J. Schaefer: There was a sequence of contemporary (Western) civilization at Columbia College, which started in 1927.

Prof. Maier: And "world" developed from "Western;" I think that is clear.

Prof. Russell B. Thomas: We really had a history before that. It grew out of a course that the Army started during World War I called "War Aims." (Laughter) This was changed to "Peace Aims," and gradually Western civilization grew out of that.

Prof. Maier: The Government will be pleased to hear that. -- We'll conclude the morning session here and resume again at 1:30 this afternoon.

* * *

Prof. Maier: We discuss now "The 'Ideal' History of Civilization Course." This is, perhaps, too presumptuous a title. But before we begin criticizing the deficiencies in these courses, some kind of standard should be identified. We have requested Prof. T. Walter Wallbank, of the University of Southern California, to give an opening presentation.

Prof. Wallbank: It is really a pleasure, Gentlemen, to be with so many distinguished colleagues. -- I find it a little difficult and possibly invidious to talk about an "ideal" history of civilization course, because naturally I might be inclined to think that I had already worked out materials for an ideal course. But I want to assure all of my eminent fellow authors in the field that I have selected an ideal history of civilization course that has absolutely no relevance to any textbook now in existence, including Wallbank and Taylor. Much has been said about the critical juncture of the course at the present time. There was really never a time when a course like this, I think, was more urgently needed, and yet at the same time we have all of these problems which we have touched upon: the preparation of our faculty members, the pressure of specialization, the pressure of what we might call the other society -- the non-humanistic and the scientific -- upon our curriculum, the utilitarian and the vocational. I'm very happy to see, of course, that even we who really believe in the worth of this course are raising very, very fundamental questions, and that is a healthy situation.

I'm not going to comment on the weaknesses that stem from this problem of staff members and graduate assistants, and so on. To me the central problem is the tremendous mass of material which is now involved. I'd like to refer to my own experience. I went to Berkeley shortly after the First World War and I took the basic survey which certainly was not even a history of Western civilization. We started at 476 A.D. and ended with 1919. It was almost exclusively political. Dr. Paetow, who was a very eminent medievalist at that time, told the graduate assistants that the Merovingian and Carolingian periods were really very vital for understanding Western history. There was absolutely nothing on the non-West. Now since 1919, of course, the world has been revolutionized, its old face has been toppled, and above all you have the emergence of the Afro-Asian World, and this situation raises fundamental questions which I would like to comment upon.

Shall this course be exclusively Western, as possibly indicated by Dr. Perkins, offered in two semesters with perhaps some attention paid to the impact of the West (i.e., the thrust of colonialism and imperialism) but basically a Western civilization course? Or shall it be a one-year offering in which, by means of considerable dexterity and possibly not much success, there shall be a treatment of the non-West in a kind of integrated world history? Now I think both these strands have relevance. Dr. Bruun was a pioneer in the Western strand, and possibly Dr. Taylor and myself were pioneers in the world-approach strand. -- Or shall there be a much more ambitious program? We could have, for example, a two-semester Western followed by the non-Western in a third semester, which might even be made optional. Or should we be much more ambitious and institute a two-year program which would be truly world civilization? Now, referring to the first two strands -- the two-semester all-Western and the other strand, the world approach possibly with more emphasis on the West than the East but containing all of the truly major cultures -- these are the two general and standard courses given at the present time. In the first, that is the Western, I would be inclined to say that too much is done with too little. In the second, the world approach, too little is done with too much. Now I have been asked to suggest an ideal course and it raises all kinds of questions. Certainly, some of the traditional ideas and some of the sacred cows will have to be scrapped or modified. I was quite interested in the reference to Dr. Packard, and in his digest to introductory history courses, as far back as 1941, he wrote that "we have probably put into these courses all they will ever hold and the next step must be selection and omission, a process which calls for judgment and courage." And, I would add, considerable acrimony, debate, and possibly even violence. I read an essay by Prof. Strayer recently in which he discussed this problem -- I believe it was in New Perspectives in Social Science -- and I thought that he was certainly courageous, because he suggested that there would have to be great condensation someplace and the logical place for this, if we are going to have the non-West introduced, would be possibly in the ancient and the medieval period, Dr. Strayer. I'm going to tread very carefully here.

Now, as a basis for discussion let us see what we might do. First of all, I suggest that we must accept the idea of a basic course of two semesters as the standard. After all, what will the traffic bear? I'd like to have more time and more room, but I think two semesters must be regarded as standard. There may be more ambitious offerings in certain specific situations, but they will be peripheral; I don't think they will be the standard.

The second point I should like to stress is that the so-called cultural approach should be the basis of organization. I use the term "culture" in the broadest sense of the culture pattern, that is, the interweaving of the various significant facets of the economic and the social, the ideational and the artistic into the all-important framework of a developing political history. I do believe that the political aspect of history is the easiest framework to give the time-bridge that we have talked about. It gives us the continuity; we have the necessary pegs on which we can hang our data. I've always been concerned about how much of the so-called cultural, using it in an artistic way, we can include. We have such a raft of literary characters and literary masterpieces. I feel that the answer is primarily to emphasize the artistic, that is, the creation of beauty, the literary, the philosophical, the ideational in terms of its reflection on social and economic conditions. In other words, the social significance of things is very important, although the purely aesthetic is very significant too. So we have the cultural approach.

The third point I would make is that non-Western areas must be included somewhat. After all, the world is being so integrated, so compressed, and therefore something must be known about the traditional way of life of the Hindu, the Muslim, the Chinese, and in more recent times the African. With our Western centrism we have even robbed the non-Western people of their own heritage. I was quite amused when I went to Africa for the first time in 1936. I landed in Mombasa in Kenya, and the British educational authorities were very good in showing me around -- and I visited schools. I went to an Arab school in this port city and looked over the curriculum, and one of the most important poems was "Snowbound" by Whittier. The second thing that interested me was one of the novels that they were struggling through: these young Arab boys, Muslims, were reading The Talisman, where the Crusaders gave these heathens what for! Now, coming from the plane yesterday I sat next to a young Nigerian student and we talked about various things. I said, "Of course, you are very much interested in your African history," and he replied, "What history are you talking about? I went to an English school in Nigeria and I know a lot about the Wars of the Roses." This is a very bad situation, and I think our emphasis on our Western civilization has in a sense robbed some of these people of their own birthright.

Now another suggestion that I should like to have you consider: what part of the course in world civilization should really have the greatest emphasis? I'm going to hazard the suggestion that it should be the period of the last one hundred years. Now, a modern medievalist -- Dr. Strayer, I use that term in a commendatory sense -- has written that one basic rule is clear enough: the student should have more information about his own country. This is taken care of adequately, and I add parenthetically, in our numerous courses on American history. I don't know how many the students have since the third grade. And then Dr. Strayer goes on by saying: "...more information about his own country and his own age than about remote areas in time." And I believe I recall, Dr. Strayer, that in this chapter you said that generally speaking the average citizen should have more information about the nineteenth and twentieth centuries than about the thirteenth century. We are dealing with students who are not going to be history majors, the great bulk of them. We do want to stimulate the interest of potential historians whom we will ultimately welcome into our fraternity, but we are dealing mainly with Mr. Average Citizen. So we have got to try to give our average citizens some conception of the wonder of how mankind has created its civilization and the problems that our young people have to face.

Now I suppose it would be absurd to say that the significance of history depends primarily and directly upon its recency, but most of our people are vitally interested in the rise of Soviet Russia. Where did communism come from? What preceded the United Nations? Why did the League of Nations fail, and why is it that the West almost committed suicide in two terrible world wars? In short, they are urgently concerned with the great historical forces of the last one hundred years. After all, young people are vitally interested in this world in which they live. It's been my unfortunate experience that in this world survey course I generally terminate about 1925 or 1930; I'm lucky if I get through the Second World War. The tempo of interest of the average student, however, seems to gradually kindle as you get into the nineteenth and the recent years of the twentieth century.

Well, there is my "ideal course." It may be a remote ideal and I would like to discuss its practicability for just a few moments. How can we have a one-year West and non-West synthesis which will be satisfactory and yet at the same time give reasonable emphasis to the significant achievements of our developing civilization? Possibly much could be done in merging the now separate, the disparate parts, into larger wholes. Too much material, I think, in Western politics has been focused around the rise of the

2

sacrosanct nation-state. I think our young people -- and we have the perspective now -- should be given the story in terms of seeing the making of the nation-state as a rather unique and significant development in Western Europe. We could show the similarities, the differences, and yet the general historical development of the nation-state in Germany, and so on. Cannot we get a larger configuration? Then probably some of the traditional material long held sacred by European-oriented historians -- and I include myself in that group -- will have to be compressed. One historian, I think it was Dr. Bruun, made the revolutionary suggestion that the starting point of Western civilization should be 1500 A.D.

Now a few examples of what I am trying to get at, that is, dealing with larger wholes than many separate parts. Take ancient civilization, for example: let us consider reducing the coverage on specific areas and stop worrying about the Old Kingdom and the New Kingdom and the Empire of Ancient Egypt, and present a single pattern of what mankind did within a certain specific chronological period in four river valleys, and above all, show the general significance of this fourfold achievement for mankind. In the classical period, three types of civilization were being crystallized: the Greco-Roman, the Mauryan in India, and the Han in China. I'm sorry that, chronologically at least, we couldn't have the fourth great civilization and way of life which came somewhat later, which would be the Islamic. But this could be done in the medieval strand. Now in the medieval we have these sorts of chunks of man's activity: the European situation, sometimes called "The Age of Faith;" the Gupta in India; the Islamic; and then the T'ang and the Sung. We could point out the similarities between these civilizations, but the focus would be upon the whole rather than a lot of small parts. Some of you have dipped into Prof. McNeill's recent work, The Rise of the West. I found it intensely stimulating, but I agree with Dr. Strayer that some of the generalizations were outrageous. Nevertheless, one of the most fascinating things is this culture diffusion which I think we have neglected. In Africa it is amazing to visit some of these new nations, and in the case of Nkrumah's Ghana to visit Parliament and see "Mr. Speaker" wearing his wig and the symbolic mace being brought in. Thus, you could see the ghost of the Mother of Parliaments there at Ghana. Of course, it has become much more of a ghost in recent times. Everywhere you go you see this terrific thrust of Western culture into these areas, but in former times there was a great deal of intercultural contact which probably we have neglected. By emphasizing these basic contributions, the borrowing of the West from the East and vice versa, I think you develop in the students some appreciation of the fact that world civilization is not the product of any single people -- of any single race -- and I think it is a very salutary corrective to keep stressing to our students that the supremacy of the West came in very recent times in terms of the long time-pattern of world history.

In addition to medieval, in modern history surely the time has come for some kind of reorganization. I don't know exactly what it would be. I've always thought of 1815 as a significant stopping and starting point. And then you come to 1870, and from there to 1914. Now, surely we could have some kind of new organization. I suggest that probably the whole period since 1870 could be considered as a single whole in which there is not only the rise of Western supremacy to its apogee but also the decline of, at least, Western direct control. And then you have the development of the 'isms of totalitarianism and the rise of international organizations.

I don't know whether I am right or not, but I think that if we could develop these larger wholes we might be able to dispense with so much factual material.

Now, all of this has been purely conjecture. I may not even believe what I have said because the whole thing is so complicated, and this "ideal course" of mine is probably only an imperfect exercise in intellectual imagination. One of the things that we have got to keep in mind, I think, is that there are interesting developments taking place in the high school. In California where we have been very "progressive" in our educational curriculum, with disastrous results, we now are trying to change. I was very happy to see that in the Los Angeles School District, which is a very large school district as well as a very confused one, we have developed a year-and-a-half offering of world history. Now, the first two semesters are Western oriented, but in the third they have a non-Western approach in which they just concentrate on the ways of life and problems in the emerging nations. Now if the high school, of course, does a bang-up job it may mean that our problem will be slightly less difficult. However, during the past year at the University of Southern California, I had a discussion group for the first time in a number of years -- I usually give just the large lectures -- and I was rather depressed as a result of my experience with these young people who have in the main come from Los Angeles high schools. Generally, they came to college with very inadequate grounding in world history. Now I don't know whether mass education on the secondary level necessarily has to be mess education -- particularly with the problem of racial integration and the confusion that is taking place in our large cities. I found that these students were in no way able to handle the kind of material that I wanted to give them. I selected a number of pamphlets from the Heath Historical Series, which dealt with various conflicts in historical interpretation, and the students just didn't have the historical background. They could not absorb the material. They didn't have the vocabulary to express their ideas in abstractions. And so you have this problem of the high school.

My only interest has really been to spark discussion, and I hope some controversy. We may, of course, be able to work out some kind of consensus. So, here is the football, and I hope you give it a real good kicking around.

Prof. Maier: Football or bombshell, shall we say, in terms of textual revision. Thank you so much, Prof. Wallbank. -- Are there any reactions to Prof. Wallbank's presentation?

Prof. Cochrane: I just want to express my utter horror at the abolition of all the centuries of civilization for the sake of logical categories.

Prof. Bruun: I would like to defend myself against the inference that I proposed that European civilization begin with 1500. I was proposing it in context as a possible, not a drastic, solution to this question of what we must drop if we are to include more. I said that that is, of course, one of the expedients that have already been developed in some cases. What I would do, if I may compound my error, is to suggest that we drop medieval Europe -- well, that we play down the period from four to fourteen hundred as of really very little global significance -- and that we substitute a thousand years of Asian history. I understand that is what the new United Nations' History of the World is to do. Essentially, the millennium from roughly four hundred to fourteen hundred will be the Asian period of world history. Then from fourteen hundred to the present will be the European phase of world history.

Now, these are counsels of perfection which are, of course, not to be considered for adoption. (Laughter) But I do think we have a certain vested interest, should we say, in the way history is taught. It will be extremely difficult to change even as much as Prof. Wallbank has suggested. I don't think we can anticipate any very radical refashioning of the civilization course. My reason for saying this is that some thirty years ago, Ferguson and I went to work analyzing what the course taught and prepared a textbook to fit it. And with no very drastic revisions that textbook is apparently used in a good many of the courses as now given. While my publishers might not applaud, I think that is a criticism of the course. I think it has need to break away from certain straitjackets that have enclosed it, and among those I would suggest, of course, a transition which the Wallbank and Taylor text began twenty years ago; a transition towards a genuine world history presentation. That will mean breaking down the Western European emphasis. Geoffrey Barraclough has complained that our emphasis on Western Europe is robbing history of sense and significance, and I have a feeling that the heavy and excessive emphasis on Western Europe, which we find in what is called civilization courses, is quite indefensible. I would say that instead of giving 70 to 80 percent to Western Europe, possibly 50 percent would be a more adequate measure. I think the suggestion, for instance, of running all the growth of the individual national states together as "The Rise of the National State" is an excellent idea. In the same way, instead of the various colonial empires, "Colonialism." In other words, substitute the word "European" for "European States," and then take in Europe merely as one civilization.

Prof. Wallbank: I'd like to hear comments on what is the most functional aspect of the course that we are trying to give. Is there any validity to this thought of mine that for the average young American citizen it would be well, possibly, to stress the last century?

Now, Prof. Cochrane, I didn't mean to intimate, of course, that the earlier period should be completely neglected. I think that there were many important traditions, many important aspects of our society that were developed during the ancient periods and even during the Renaissance, but something has got to give. Are we going to stop with 1815 or 1914? What are we going to do, and what part of this strand of world history should get the largest emphasis?

Prof. Cochrane: May I ask a further question, then? I don't necessarily want to include the Renaissance in anything at all. I wonder how you are going to explain the appearance of any kind of a civilization at a particular year. Now, if you take an arbitrary year like 1800 or 1500, how are you going to make the student conscious of how this happened to occur at this particular moment?

Prof. Wallbank: I don't think any of us could answer that question.

Prof. Cochrane: This is the basic historical problem.

Prof. Wallbank: Yes.

Prof. Cochrane: In other words, we are taking something contemporary, as modern American universities, and trying to understand historically what this institution is doing here. We are obviously asking a question of time, and we would never understand why we have an institution like the one we are in now unless we understand something about the background that has brought about this sort of institution, and that means going all the way back to Paris in the 11th and 12th centuries. Now, if you simply tell the student that you are arbitrarily beginning with something that has already been created, that would be all right. However, it seems to me this gives a rather warped concept, or, it defeats one of the purposes of such a course: to introduce the student to the method of thinking historically.

Prof. Wallbank: Can't you give the student some understanding of the basic process? After all, this is a rather elementary course, and you cannot go into all of the aspects of causation; but in the earlier period, instead of spending as much time as we have on, say, Abelard and Heloise and so on, we can deal with these strands of developments. After all, from say 1300 to the middle of the 18th century, tremendous things happened in the Western world in terms of technology, the rise of the natural sciences, the development of a bureaucratic, well administered state, etc. Couldn't these be given to the student and discussed in terms of the basic developments?

Prof. Cochrane: I wonder how you can explain -- well, even such a thing as the rise of natural science in the 17th century.

Prof. Wallbank: You can't explain it, of course, completely because not many of us can explain it right now ourselves.

Prof. Cochrane: But in so far as a historical explanation is possible, unless you simply say, "We're not going to bother with this question. We'll start at this point and go on."

Prof. Kelly: I'd like to get in this argument a little bit because I have taught such a course. I guess I haven't had a section in what we call our History of Civilization course in a couple of years, but short of that I have taught it for about thirty years. What you are really arguing about, it seems to me, is a real dilemma: whether the past is to be considered as valid in itself or whether the past has validity only for the present. The dilemma is brought home to the student, although he can't express this in terms of the symbols of metaphysics or perhaps of the historical profession. He feels this dilemma too. If you deal with Abelard as Abelard he is not interested, because he has another idea here which he can't articulate, but which is valid for him; that is, what might be called the discontinuity of history. This I think is one of the dilemmas which historians don't like to face in the profession. It's the dilemma which the social scientists and such go overboard to emphasize, I would say, but the discontinuity of history is the thing that the student feels. Now, if you are going to talk about the Middle Ages to this youngster, what you confront him with is in the first instance a discontinuity of history, and if you are going to overcome this discontinuity of history, you must do this in one of two ways, it seems to me. One possible way of overcoming it is to show the past as the present; that is, that Abelard is in some fashion with us now.

I don't think this is intellectually an impossible task, although Abelard may be a bad place to start with this. But certainly in the past as present you can get intellectual synthesis of a sort. I have a tentative notion that except in so far as you do this with Abelard and Heloise or with the fall of the Roman Empire or with Periclean Athens, you don't quite hold the student. Now, at the same time as a historian I should think I'd feel the sense of the craft that we want the past to be the past, so I would try to sneak up on the student and give him the past as the past in itself at the same time I give him the past as the present; which leads to the other thing that I think that the past as the past in itself has to do for the student, and that is that you must eventually see man beyond a particular civilization in such a course. I'm a little bit inarticulate here, but you have to see all civilizations as facing eventually certain problems that have a common practical character or a certain element foundation in reality, a certain basic ultimate approach to reality. The student has to grasp the notion, after all, that Greeks were men who faced certain tragedies of existence, certain ultimate realities of an economic, a metaphysical, and a historical kind. If he gets this he begins to get the notion of comparative civilization, and he begins to overcome the notion of discontinuity which is the most potent thing you have to fight against in this course: "What do I care about the Greeks?"

About five years ago, Prof. Maurice Ashley came to Wayne and lectured on Cromwell, and I can remember the comment of a student after the lecture which was really quite scholarly and intelligent. In an "aside" which I overheard, he said: "What's Cromwell to me? I don't care whether there was a Cromwell. What do I care about the Battle of Naseby? This is nothing to me." I think it is this problem which we must overcome, and we can overcome it only by creating the sense in the student of the past as present, that sense of continuity and relevance. You can also sneak up on him and eventually give him the past as the eternal truth. This, pedagogically, is the way we have tried to solve the problem.

Prof. Perkins: Well, I feel very modest about this because I haven't taught a course in Western civilization for a long time, although I have kept in contact with it. I rather fear the dilution of the course in Western civilization by having an introduction of all the elements. Now, I think it is highly important to understand a society different from our own, and I would not wish to see medieval history scamped from that point of view. Here is a society varying in orientation from the 20th-century manner, and I think we need to cultivate the gift of understanding a society other than that in which we live. Now I think it can be done within the framework of the Western society. I think we have a big job to do in the Western field. After all we are Westerners, and to understand our own society is a large order in itself. Now in saying that, I don't mean to imply that we have to be completely narrow about it. I don't see how any course of a general character could fail to discuss the rise and decline of colonialism and the problems suggested by that rise and fall; but I wouldn't make the emphasis too heavy. I agree with much of what Mr. Cochrane just said about science -- I don't think you can understand science if you begin with 1815 or something like that. I believe the intellectual strands of the Western world can only be dealt with in a continuous fashion, and they have to be made intelligible.

Prof. Thomas: I want to ask a question rather than make a statement. We have stressed in this discussion, that for many of the students the course which we are talking about, whether it is Western civilization or world civilization, may be the only history course which our students may be taking; and therefore that a great burden rests upon the instructors for achieving a sense of completeness in the view of history that we are giving. But I want to ask whether this is an assumption which we ought to make or are always justified in making. I know that in some institutions a history of Western civilization or reasonable alternative courses are paralleled by other courses which give students a historical introduction to the intellectual and aesthetic products of Western culture. I can cite Amherst as an example. It has a two-year requirement in the social sciences; the first year is modern European history, and the second year is American civilization. These courses, however, are paralleled by a required humanities course in the freshman year, which is a study of a selection of great achievements in Western thought from ancient Greece to the present day. The writings studied include philosophic, poetic, and historical works. The orientation of the course is historical. I am asking therefore if we have taken full account of all of the courses which contribute to the students' understanding of history, even though some of the courses may not be under the direction of the history department. If we could assume this kind of parallel development of historical problems in courses offered by other departments, what we might do in a history of civilization course might be greatly different from what we would be forced to do if ours were the only course required of all the students.

Prof. Alastair M. Taylor: Well, speaking as a Canadian and therefore one in whom compromise is a congenital defect (laughter), I wonder whether it is necessary to think in terms of simple dichotomies. I know there is much merit in the problem of whether we regard the past as past or the past as prologue, whether we are concerned with the casual or the causal, the continuity or the discontinuity -- these are basic problems in historiography, as we know. I suspect, Dr. Bruun, that different textbooks will continue to be written, and properly so, simply because one author or set of authors will wish to address himself, let us say, to the past as past rather than to the past as prologue. I personally would like to see both approaches incorporated; that is my congenital defect. I am sure Prof. Wallbank and I would certainly not want in any way to slough off the past or not get down to specifics in the way of chronological treatment. But I would like to emphasize, for myself, the feeling that for most of the students, the past probably is going to be thought of largely as prologue; they are going to take a rather functional or even utilitarian approach to the subject matter. I think a considerable number of students would tend to share a sneaking agreement with Henry Ford's dictum of what history is all about. I think they are concerned with Fords, even Model A Fords, but they are concerned with technology. Interestingly enough, I noted this morning that in both Prof. Perkins' and in Prof. Bruun's remarks, which I applauded in each case, they emphasized the value of saying more about technology and science. Dr. Bruun, I thought, presented a most interesting example that, given the chronological problem of Indian history, technology may provide a useful method of obtaining a deeper understanding of Indian history in turn. But then as the East is becoming more technologically oriented, the West may be technologically over-oriented in turn. Here is an area of common agreement. Similarly, the student today is technology-oriented. He wants to know the background of his technological order. Now if we are talking about two strands, two cultures -- East and West -- which may be able to be bridged by a greater understanding of technology, then I suggest that whether you adopt the Western strand or the world strand there is pressing need to assess not only the evolution but the significance of mankind's technological response to its environmental challenge; similarly, that in either strand you still have to face a basic philosophical problem: a lack of communication between the humanistic values and the technological values. I personally would like to see more emphasis in volume two of either a Western- or World-structured survey course, on how this divergence began to develop; the problems of communication; what are the societal implications of accelerating material technology? This is germane to the student's world; I don't care if he is going to be a history major or whether he is going to be in commerce. There is an immediacy about this, it seems to me, of the utmost significance to our student population.

Prof. Dunbar: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is a proper moment to raise this particular point, but I think it is somewhat germane to this discussion. I hope that the conference will find it possible to discuss it before we are through. What I am referring to is the fact that we're talking about a course covering something and aren't defining what we mean by the course. We have a textbook and readings; we have lectures and in many cases some sort of student participation in the form of discussion. Now, does the lecture cover what the textbook does? Is there a peculiar function, do you think, of the lecture that should be different from the textbook or the readings? What about the discussion, if any, which follows; is it again merely a rehashing of the textbook and the lecture, or does it have some unique function? These are questions upon which I hope you gentlemen will give us your wisdom.

Prof. Maier: These items are very germane, of course, and I think they will be discussed later under the topic "structure of the course." -- Could we proceed now in further determining our "ideal" history of civilization course by exploring what material can and should be covered in this long cavalcade called history of mankind. Here we will have three commentators: Profs. Joseph Strayer, Goldwin Smith, and Russell Thomas. First, Prof. Strayer.

Prof. Strayer: When I was told that I had ten minutes to do this job, I was appalled (laughter), but then I did a little ratio in my head and I said ten minutes is to one year of a history course as that one year is to some four thousand years of recorded history, and I discovered I had the best of that ratio, so I am not complaining.

Let me start with something I wasn't going to say -- Prof. Wallbank put it well and I want to emphasize it again. If we had a decent course in secondary schools on world history or history of civilization, whatever you want to call it, our job would be far easier than it is now simply because learning history is an accumulative process. The first time you hear a name or an idea in history, it doesn't stick very well; you hear it again under a slightly different aspect, a different angle, and it begins to make sense. Just learning the names would help us. The trouble is we don't have good high-school courses in most places, and it is proving very hard to get anyone interested in making those courses better. Unlike our Chairman, when the American Historical Association approached the Government and various foundations for a study of high-school courses in world history, we were not awarded a grant. This job badly needs to be done, and if it were it would help us a lot.

Now, having said that, I'll get on with the present situation. Students are pretty innocent, pretty naive about any history except their own. One thing, by the way, that I discovered in working on this problem was that over the country as a whole, about fifty percent of the high school students take the world history course. On the whole, this is the fifty percent who don't go to college. The ones who are going to college are busy learning higher mathematics, languages, and things of that sort; this is one of our troubles.

Why do we have this survey course in the freshman year? Why do we think history is valuable? I think that's the first question. As I see it, it is valuable because it teaches you what human behavior is like. It gives you some possibility of predicting or, at least, adjusting to forms of behavior that you don't run into in your own ordinary daily life, and it presents this kind of knowledge in a way that should be interesting. There is a story to it instead of the rather cold analysis of the economists or the political scientist.

When you are studying human behavior as a historian, it seems to me you have got two axes. The horizontal axis is the one in which you try to find out what a given society was like at a certain period. And there the things I would look for would be the way they organized and how people worked together; what sort of institutions did they have in order to get things done? Second, what would be their specialties, their technologies in the broadest sense of the word? I agree entirely that technology is a subject which fascinates our students, and they do like to know how people were able to make, say, sulfuric acid before anybody understood the theory or even knew what sulfuric acid was composed of. I was the whole history department of an engineering school once. They are very much interested in how buildings were constructed by Romans, by men of the Middle Ages, and so on. They are also interested, if you put it in the way of how the job is done rather than a list of names, in how people painted pictures and why people painted pictures. The three essentials are organization, specialization, and then finally the system of beliefs which underpins, supports, and modifies the first two. Now any society can be analyzed from these three points of view; I don't think it matters very much which one you pick.

The other axis, the vertical axis, is the one that everyone has been talking about, and that is the time axis -- development, process, and change. It is absolutely essential -- again everybody said this -- for undergraduates to get a sense of change. May I say also that it is important for them to get a sense of how slow change can be as well as how fast it is. I suppose most of you have had the experience of teaching a course and as soon as the first bourgeois appears, then you have a capitalistic society and the nobility has been discomfitted, and you wonder why there ever had to be a French Revolution. But at any rate, the idea of change and various rates and paces of change are extremely important to get across.

Now, involving the horizontal and vertical axes, we want to give students a feeling for various forms of human behavior, various types of human organization, specialization, and systems of belief. Here I would come down pretty strongly on emphasizing the Western experience, not because of any ethnocentric convictions on my part, but simply because this is the easiest one to deal with in the terms that I want to deal with it. It also has the best material available for students at this level. And finally, it has turned out to be the form of society which is having the greatest impact on the rest of the world today.

You can't do the whole story of Western civilization in one year -- at least I can't do it. I think here you want to remember a remark that William James once made, that a man can see into a generalization only so far as his knowledge of detail goes. You do need some detail. There are a lot of facts that are helpful, and unless you can give them enough specific examples, your generalizations aren't going to do you very much good. Therefore, I would not try to fit in the whole story, the whole background, but deal intensively with a relatively limited period.

My own personal preference, naturally enough as a medievalist, is to start with the 12th century. I won't omit the Middle Ages, in spite of the very strong remarks on the subject. I won't do it because it is in that period that the characteristic European institutions took shape. The nation-state -- sure, treat it as a whole. You don't have to do individual national history. But the nation-state, the European type of bureaucracy, European law, European government, parliamentary institutions all begin then -- the European intellectual tradition. You cannot understand modern science or the origins of modern science without understanding what went on in the 12th, 13th, and 14th centuries. You can't understand the European economic system, and so on. Remember, when you talk about four hundred to fourteen hundred A.D. being an Asian millennium, that on the whole the things which enabled Europe to go ahead and end that Asian millennium were things that developed in the Middle Ages. You take the poor,battered Europe, say of about 1350, and yet that's the same Europe which is dominating the trade routes of the world, beginning to dominate the world in other ways, just a hundred years later. How did this happen? I'd start then, as I say, with the Middle Ages at their height, with their development of particularly European ways of doing things. I would certainly have to go back and explain what they had taken from the ancient world, but I would do that as a flash-back. Then I would proceed with the European story, and I think the advice I gave before I would still give: I would give more and more detail as I got closer and closer to the present, not merely because of the fact that this is what will hold attention best, but for a pedagogical reason. Our students aren't going to finish their education in college if they are good students; they will continue educating themselves the rest of their lives. We want them to go on being interested in this process of historical development. If you want them to finish the book, or at least as much of the book as will be written in their lifetime, then they had better read the latest chapters in the book. If you have to cut out anything it is easier to cut out the prologue than the last two or three chapters.

Now, how do you deal with this problem of the other civilizations? This is a very real one. It is necessary to do something about them, and we haven't the time to do it. Ideally, you should have two years. We have this in theory at Princeton. The first year is a survey of Western civilization, more or less as I have described it, and the second is a survey of Far Eastern civilization. The only trouble is that, short of outrageous compulsion, we can't get everybody to take those two courses. The proportions are about five to one; for five men who take Western Europe, one man takes the survey of the Far East. Obviously, this isn't good enough. Well, here again I think you will have to allow for continuing education. If you get a man interested in this kind of problem he may do something on it himself. What I try to do is to weave in to some extent the continuing development of another civilization, and for obvious reasons the one that I pick is Islamic civilization, because it has close connections with the West -- you can see the interchange of ideas and forces between the two -- and again because we happen to have, I think, better reading on this particular civilization than we have on some others. It also helps with one of the problems that I am very much interested in, that many of you have mentioned: the development of science. One of the great puzzles in history is why the West picked up science just at the moment that Islam dropped it, and this is a very good way of again showing contacts between two civilizations.

Well, if I didn't have this particular interest I think that I would be perfectly content to try to weave in some parallel developments with, say, the civilization of China in its classical period and follow it along down to the point where close contact with the West begins to mingle the two together.

Now, I don't think any of this is foolproof. I don't think any of it will work with all people. What I will argue is that there must be some kind of selection of this sort. We are going to have to take samples and we ought to take a fairly big sample; we ought to take a sample that will show continuity and development, but we certainly can't tell the whole story.

Prof. Goldwin Smith: Professor Maier asked me if I would prepare a ten-minute statement on the subject: "The History of Man -- What Can and Should Be Covered." I was moved slightly from my usual Canadian delicate equipoise and thought of the large number of students who entered our classrooms filled with an indefeasible desire to know and a still larger number who entered with an unwilling suspension of disbelief. I realized that I had only ten minutes to list for you my purely private heresies that will be discussed; and in this limited time period I propose to state some general principles and aims, some guidepost maxims, and a few specific recommendations.

One: Any world history course should be so organized, I submit, that it will stress the historical events and developments which are most relevant to the twentieth century. One important question is this: What is most relevant and useful to the American undergraduate student today? A functionally valuable course in world civilization must have, on every page, some answers to this question.

Two: The history of recent centuries, and I repeat what has been said, is particularly useful and important to the American undergraduate in 1964. A modern civilization course and textbook should be planned with cumulative chronological emphasis.

Three: All ideas, peoples, principles, precedents, and institutions stressed in a civilization course should be deliberately selected. They should always emphasize the roots from which contemporary societies have derived their character, their form, and their strength.

Four: If these directing principles deserve endorsement, then certain consequences would seem to emerge as inevitable corollaries. Some of these conclusions mark a sharp departure from the usual pattern of world civilization courses. It will be necessary, certainly, to reconsider, to compress, and to delete certain themes, perhaps long honored and loved by teachers of history.

Five: I recommend that the sections on mathematics -- this is a familiar theme -- and science be sharply increased. For instance, I am convinced that not enough is said in many world civilization texts and classes about technological progress in the Middle Ages in Europe, or about the achievements of science in China. Let us spend more time with Copernicus, geography and exploration, mathematics and science, the tides of trade, and more of what Prof. Joseph Needham has to say about China.

Six: I also suggest a much greater emphasis upon economic and social history, including transportation, mass migrations, and population problems. For instance, let us pay more attention to craft guilds and wool, to Fuggers in the Middle Ages, to the Renaissance, and the economic and political backgrounds of the Reformation than we now do. Let us look a little bit less at the snows of Canossa and the conflicts of popes and emperors, and the nature of sacerdotium and regnum in the medieval years. Of what consequence to the undergraduate student is the collection and storage of matter-of-fact knowledge about the German feudal duchies, the struggle for Italy in the 15th and 16th centuries, and a detailed study of the patternless Bourbon and Hapsburg rivalries? In the ancient world, of what relevance today is the rivalry of the successors of Alexander the Great? The intricate and significant changes of recent centuries in the world of economics and technological developments must surely take an increasingly prominent place in the classes and textbooks for the student of world history in the 20th century. So, too, must the passages about social revolutions, commercial explosions, financial history, and the history of communication.

I recommend as a subject for later discussion the suggestion that several of the sections about art and literature in world history courses be reduced. I feel that the attempt to include many chapters or classes about literature and art in world history results in a continued imbalance between the two cultures -- between the world of humanities and the history of science, mathematics, economics, and technology. In a teachable text of a thousand pages we should not try to embrace too much. A little knowledge is a dangerous, stifling, and deceptive thing. It impairs the general welfare. World history courses must not be made the stagnant catch-alls for what is omitted elsewhere in the curriculum.

Seven: I suggest that long discussions about ideological and political controversies of the past be omitted unless they clearly influenced large numbers of people and covered long periods of time. It is a sobering thought that much time may be spent in the classroom in the uneasy discussion of long-dead disputes, once the concern of a few divided and uncertain men with horizons remote from ours. A study of heretical movements in the Middle Ages, for example, is a fascinating intellectual operation, but its importance, surely, fades into the background of the age's inheritance of positive achievement.

A little later this afternoon I'll speak, perhaps with more precision, about some of the points I hope I have made here.

Prof. Thomas: I must explain to everyone here that I am one of the few people at this conference who is not by profession a historian or a teacher of history. My justification for being here, then, is that I have had long experience in the teaching of history of civilization courses and have some knowledge from the standpoint of a person trained primarily to teach literature with the way these courses have functioned. The ones which I have known most intimately have been histories of Western civilization, as most of the early general humanities courses have been in this country.

I remember, shortly after the close of the war, I was talking with Ferdinand Schevill, who had been as responsible as anyone for the development of the first "History of Civilization" course at the University of Chicago which began in 1931 and 1932. He had just completed the last revision of his History of Modern Europe, and he said: "This is the last time this book will ever be revised. From now on history is global. It will be impossible to write a history of Western Europe any more that will not take into account the rest of this planet." I think that is a fact which all of us have to recognize ourselves; that in the interest of the students whom we are teaching, whether it is a course in Western civilization or a world history course, the teaching itself will have to be directed to the kind of world in which we live now, one that is no longer confined to the northern hemisphere between the Mediterranean basin and the eastern shore of the Pacific Ocean.

Our discussions have emphasized the importance of the sense of time, the continuity of history. We have said very little about another dimension of history, namely space. Geographical relationships seem to me to be as important as temporal ones in accounting for the processes of history.

It is curious to me that despite our emphasis on the importance of understanding the continuity of the historical process of time, we have often overlooked it in the organization of history of civilization courses. We have reduced large segments of time -- a century, five hundred, or even a thousand years -- to static periods to which we attach descriptive names like the "Medieval Mind" or the "Enlightenment" or the "Romantic Era." In the history of Western civilization, at least in such courses as I have taught, we have incorporated political, social, and cultural history and have included a study of works representative of the intellectual and aesthetic achievements of men in each of these large temporal units. In general, however, our study of these works treats them as examples of the descriptive label we have attached to each segment of time. Thus, Madame Bovary is historically significant only as an example of the intellectual trait of the latter nineteenth century called Realism. The chief criticism I have of one-year required history of civilization courses is that they have tended to reduce action and intellectual achievement to a common denominator which provides a specious characterization of the temporal blocks. For students whose knowledge of history will end with such a course there are dangers of a distortion that will obscure the true nature of history.

Until the end of World War II, world history courses and the present spate of non-Western civilization and area study programs were almost unknown, so far as undergraduate instruction was concerned. The result was a spatial reduction of history which we are only beginning to recognize as a serious defect. The significance of history unfolding in place as well as in time has been neglected.

How do we avoid these reductions? I am thinking only in terms of histories of Western civilization and world civilization courses and of the students whose experience of history will be limited to such courses. (I must add, however, that the "history major" who goes on to specialize in medieval history or any other temporal or geographical block will have to reject many of the generalizations he has learned.) There has already been one suggestion. We have to think of the problem of history in a liberal education as not merely a collegiate problem, and we must use our energies to secure the kind of earlier foundation in high school which Mr. Strayer was speaking of. And even within the college program there ought to be a better coordination of the resources for historical instruction than there is in most institutions. History, in the broadest sense, is not the exclusive property of history departments. Literature, art, philosophy, language and, in recent years, even science are treated in their historical contexts. We have not yet made as effective a correlation of these sources of instruction as we could.

Prof. Maier: Thank you very much, Prof. Thomas. -- Just to recapitulate most briefly, the last three presentations have discussed the areas which might be emphasized in the future history of civilization course. There was also general agreement that the last centuries should receive greater stress. Were I not chairman, I would speak as an ancient historian at this point and rather vigorously take issue with several of the things that have been said. Under those circumstances, I would agree that emphasis on recent centuries is, of course, important, but the origin and development of civilization, I think, are equally as important as a more detailed chronology of its latest achievements and recent structure. In my civilization classes, I have not observed any decided "progression of interest" among students the nearer we approached the present day. Certainly they are fascinated by events in World Wars I and II, for example, but they followed the strategy of Hannibal vs. the Romans with at least the same enthusiasm. Ancient and medieval history can captivate the student, and he can find great relevance in events which occurred long before the past century. I think the dictum "relevance is proportional to modernity" ought to be challenged vigorously.

Now, as to placing even more emphasis than has already been placed on the recent centuries, I can only point quantitatively to the way most two-volume texts are set up. Gentlemen, volume one in a two-volume series proceeds from c. 5000 B.C. to 1648 A.D. (or, unbelievably, 1714 A.D.), which, by the simple arithmetic of it is about six thousand, six hundred years. Volume two proceeds from 1648 to 1964 -- a scant three hundred years. Even allowing for the paucity of ancient historical sources, the ratio is still about twenty-two to one in terms of chronological coverage. So the ancient historian at this point would plead with you not to shorten his segment any more!--But this is what I would say if I were not chairman. (Laughter)

Is there any reaction, now, to the presentations of our three panelists?

Prof. Wallbank: I want to ask Dr. Thomas: Your reference to the world view -- I assume you are interested in trying to bring the non-West into the picture?

Prof. Thomas: Yes. I didn't mean to say that it had to be done within a single course, but I do think that somehow a means has to be found to confront the student with the non-West.

Prof. Wallbank: I don't know what my colleagues would say, but I believe that we have got to deal, in the average institution, with a one-year, two-semester structure.

Prof. Thomas: That brings us to a problem I barely hinted about: we are the slaves of time ourselves. The whole undergraduate program has been limited by tradition in this country to four years. That's why I said that I think there is no escape from that except through a better historical and cultural education at the pre-collegiate level.

Prof. Sullivan: I'd like to ask Prof. Strayer if he believes that it would be possible to teach a Western civilization course at the high-school level about as good as the one we are now trying to teach at the freshman level in college, thereby creating room for broadening horizons.

Prof. Strayer: This is the thing I am working on. Some of you may know I am chairman of the Committee on Teaching of the American Historical Association. There is nothing that is worrying us more than this particular problem, and we run into two difficulties here. First, the world history course usually comes very early in the high-school curriculum. It should come later, of course, because it is the more difficult, but the last year or the last two years are reserved by law in many schools for American history. So you have to teach world history at an age when the students are, in many ways, not ready for it. The other problem is that history depends very largely on reading. You can use other devices, some of which are useful, but they are, at best, supplements. In 9th or 10th grade, the amount of reading that can be assigned, especially to the lower-level students, is very small indeed. Ideally, yes, your solution would be the best one: if there were a good Western civilization course in high school we could do a lot of the things we want to do now in college and can't. Practically, we haven't found a way of doing this yet.

Prof. Dunbar: Prof. Strayer, I'd like to ask a question concerning something you said before. You said about fifty percent of the students take world history in high school. Did you say that this fifty percent are largely those who do not go on to college?

Prof. Strayer: Well, I haven't checked my figures recently, but more students who took the world history course did not go to college than did.

Prof. Dunbar: We would be justified then in assuming that, as of the time you made your study, something less than, say, twenty-five percent of the high-school students who went on to college took a world history course?

Prof. Strayer: It may have been a little better than that, but not much. As I say, the problem is that the college-bound students, especially in recent years, have been subjected to this pressure to take more mathematics, more science, more languages. This means that if you are in a system where the world history course is an elective course, and it is in many school systems, that is the one that gets squeezed out.

Prof. Gilbert Morell: Just as a point of information here: wouldn't it be pertinent to discover, since I assume that most high-school students do not go on to college, what proportion of high-school students going on to college take the world history course, as against the proportion who do not take it?

Prof. Strayer: Well, again, in this case I did not do a complete analysis, but in school systems where seventy or eighty percent of the students go to college, the proportion taking world history was no better than it was in school systems where less than fifty percent went to college. But this statistic is just an illustration. I've been asking my own entering class of freshmen how many of them have had world history, and in every case the majority have not.

Dean Schaefer: Just as an educator, I believe I can reinforce what Mr. Strayer is saying. I think these figures are getting worse every year. Some high schools are going back to the older system of having a year's course in modern European history, and in other years something else, as an option to the tenth-year world history course.

Prof. Wallbank: In California, I think the state curriculum now requires at least one year in all of our school systems, which I think is very good. But remember, the students who take it would be about 14.

Prof. Strayer: A little young, you know, to learn about Chinese civilization; even the names throw them for a loop. Yes, this is one of the problems.

Prof. Taylor: I am wondering, Gentlemen, whether I am completely wrong in seeming to discern a pattern here: namely, that we have been talking about the possibility of two different, but perhaps each equally valid, types of course. On the basis of the arguments that have been presented so far, I could envisage a course that is motivated by past as prologue; a course, in other words, in which the causal instead of the casual is emphasized, though not to the exclusion of the casual. In this course, history is considered as a social science, as a behavioral discipline, if you wish. -- There is equal merit in another type of course in which past as past and its values are emphasized; in which the casual, the uniqueness, the humanistic values are emphasized, again, not to the exclusion of the causal, but where history as finding its proper place within the humanities is emphasized. I may be wrong.

The first one, past as prologue, is, I think, geared to the fact that ultimately the student of today must recognize that in the General Assembly two-thirds of the votes are Afro-Asian, and this is his world, as it is the world of technology. It is planetary in its structure. It is technological. It is behavioral as a discipline. -- The other type is in the humanities. Each is equally valid, although I don't look on these as dichotomies at all. If there is merit in looking at this broad spectrum as divisible within two frameworks of this kind, there might be some value in this conference addressing itself to a demarcation of these areas -- to providing some kind of focus, and not without any kind of recommendation that it prefers one as opposed to the other. But I could imagine that just as today, colleges and universities make a decision whether to teach the Western strand or the world strand, so this would be another way in which a decision could be made. If the university were large enough, two types of courses might even be taught to different types of students. I think the conference might, with some merit, address itself to this factor of focus and possible demarcation.

Prof. Maier: A very significant point: some universities would have this dual possibility. Perhaps we can discuss this further in connection with Prof. Claude Buss's presentation on the "Involvement of the non-Western World" in civilization courses. I am sure his position will be in the affirmative.

Prof. Buss: We are talking about different things here. It is one thing to train a specialist for Western civilization and quite another to educate a teacher in world civilizations. The man who is making the college curriculum must define his objective. At Stanford we have a course in Western civilization which does not pretend to be a course in world civilizations. After a perfectly justifiable course in Western civilization, the curriculum-maker must still make his students aware of those parts of the world which have different standards and values. In this research project we must define whether we wish to concentrate on Western civilization or world civilizations.

I object to the use of the terms "East" and "West" because they are so imprecise. Both "East" and "West" lack common denominators. China is China, Japan is Japan, and India is India -- together they do not add up to the East. If the curriculum contains "Western Civilization" as its basic course, somewhere in the curriculum another entry must be inserted labelled "Introduction to Non-Western Civilizations" or some such title. Neither course is a substitute for the other, although the two may be linked together as a single offering.

It is in order at the outset of this research to make clear that a single course -- whatever its title -- is not intended to be the student's whole education in civilization. No course can be devised which would satisfactorily impart all the student should know about even Western civilization. One course is good for the engineering student, for example, who has time for only one such course in his crowded program. But for the person who has the time and the need, further courses must be made available in ancient history or the Renaissance. Ideally, Eastern civilizations should also be offered. At Stanford we are experimenting: we have a course in Eastern civilizations for the one-quarter student and more detailed courses for those who wish to probe more deeply.

I wish to refer to content material of courses on the East. It is not enough to teach the East as a variant of the West. The American student in particular must be made aware of the process of historical development in the East. May I use as an example the concept of progress. The idea of progress is at the heart of the way of life in the West. The East is inclined to be more fatalistic: "This is the way I was born, this will be the way I die." One of the most disruptive forces in the East has been the acceptance of the Western idea of progress, change, or ambition.

In political institutions, we find that many things which should be easy to transfer (e.g., democracy) fail to take root in Eastern soil. It is important for students to understand why. The seeds of current political conflicts lie deep in cultural differences. We talk of freedom and take for granted its obligations as well as its rights. The appreciation of the obligations of freedom is not so highly developed in the East as in the West, with the result that freedom often brings chaos and anarchy. They have different ideas about the family institution and the dignity of the individual than we have. In economics, they have their own concepts of socialism, capitalism, and the system of free enterprise. The policy-maker invites trouble who fails to take into account differences in environmental outlook. If mutual understanding is going to be possible between one small part of humanity which we represent and the large part of humanity which they represent, it must begin with our college students. If the introductory course is devoted to the West, some later provision must be made for the East.

The last point that I want to make in the study of the East and West, is that the student must be made aware of universal values. We are aware of our own values, and do not question their Western sources. We assume that if these values exist in the East, they must have derived from Western contributions. This is not necessarily so. Using different sources of evidence and following separate processes of reasoning, they have frequently arrived at comparable or identical conclusions. They have their own justification for representative government, individual equality, or national revolution as random examples. They have made invaluable contributions to such universal problems as man's relation to God and nature. These facts must be made clear somewhere in the college curriculum, whether or not it happens to be in the introductory course in civilization.

Prof. Dunbar: Do I take it , Prof. Buss, that you really feel it would be preferable to present this civilization of the East as a separate entity and not integrate it with Western civilization?

Prof. Buss: I think this is something that you are going to have to undertake in your study. You have the problems of space in your college curriculum. Now, it would be absolutely foolish for me to go to the director of our Western civilization course at Stanford and say, "Look, take out everything before 1100 and put in 400 to 1400 as the Age of Asia." Now, our General Education Committee said, "We haven't got enough room in the curriculum to require a course in Eastern civilization," so our History Department replied, "We'll offer a course in Eastern civilization; if the students want to take this in addition to Western civilization, they may do it." This is the best answer we have been able to come out with so far. I would have much preferred if our original course had been a world civilization, but that is just my own inclination. The fact is, there is a Western civilization course that serves the purpose, that has its own goals, that has its own philosophy. It is ingrained and could not be changed. The only thing we could do was to add the East to the West.

Prof. Maier: To pursue this specifically, Prof. Buss, if you were forming an entirely new course, would you think it preferable to offer a world civilization course, completely integrated, with enough time to teach both Eastern and Western civilization, or to have two separate courses: Western civilization and Eastern civilization?

Prof. Buss: You heard what Prof. Wallbank and Prof. Perkins said, and you have just got to take your choice and decide which one you want. You are not going to teach the whole business in one year. If you choose one philosophy, if you are going to try to give the development of what we in the West have become, this requires a great deal of historical background. If you try to give a broader course, say of the whole world, you organize your material differently, and what your student is going out with is entirely different. I think you have to make those individual selections in the light of what the rest of your curriculum is going to offer.

Dean Schaefer: I simply want to underscore what has just been said, and also what Prof. Taylor said, from the point of view of the teacher. I think one of the grave problems of our history of civilization course is the fact that the teacher has to operate as an amateur for a good part of the time. He cannot be a professional in the entire sweep of Western civilization. Well, it is all right to behave as an amateur, because that is an honorable role; but when you also ask him to bring in Eastern civilization, you are asking him to behave as an ignoramus. How can he know all that is necessary? It seems to me this is the same problem we had in secondary school when we tried to develop core teachers of English and history. The one or the other field suffered badly because the teacher simply was not competent to deal with the total content.

Prof. Wallbank: Of course, when you deal with West and non-West as two separate entities, in a sense you destroy the very thing that you are trying to achieve: the unity of mankind and the fact that during certain periods, men have been confronted by the same problems. They have exchanged also their skills, their technology, their philosophy, their religion. I think if you could use this horizontal approach to the activities of important groups of man during a single period of time, it is so much better than taking half of the world here and half of the world there and saying that when you take these two separate courses you get a history of mankind and a history of civilization. I don't think you do.

Prof. Buss: I feel the same way you do, Walter. If, as you suggested, the different river valleys and different parts of the world at the very beginning of time were studied as a whole, and if the Golden Age of Philosophy in Greece were compared with what was going on in philosophy at precisely the same time in China -- I like this way of showing what is happening to man, be it his organization, be it his beliefs, be it his specialty. This, to me, is the real history of civilization without reference to West or East, and I would prefer it that way. But now we are faced with the situation at our university that we cannot change.

Prof. Dunbar: When I took history in college it started with the Renaissance, and I imagine that a good many of you had the same experience. Dr. Seibert mentioned with what horror the average historian viewed the original history of Western civilization: "How can we possibly teach all this in a year?" -- Now,is what we were talking about in Prof. Wallbank's presentation merely a matter of degree? What is the difference between stretching this Western civilization course to include the East and the old problem we had of trying to accommodate ourselves to teaching Western civilization instead of Modern Europe?

Prof. Perkins: I want to reiterate what has just been said. There is still a strain on the teacher. We are asking a great deal, under any circumstances, for a man to teach a generalized course of this kind with enthusiasm and with something of a superficial knowledge. I don't like to see them go so far. The value of a study of the cultures is real, of course. I think the sense of understanding what is not germane to our own age could be introduced. In Western civilization today, you don't have to go outside the Western area to understand a society different from ours. A society of the 12th century is not identical with that of industrial America.

I taught in India a few years ago, and I am not impressed with Indian mankind. In the interim period I found myself nearly able to communicate only with educated Indians who had been at Oxford and Cambridge, who thought in Western terms. Now, I don't doubt what Prof. Buss said, that itis possible with study to understand the Indian peasants, but I felt infinitely removed from them in time and space. I just don't think that we need to go that far. In fact, I think we are endangering our project rather than making it more meaningful, if we spread it too thin.

Prof. Taylor: If I may interject, I would point out that some of us on the west bank of the Ottawa River at the moment have some difficulty in understanding or communicating with our educated compatriots in Quebec. There is difficulty in developing a meaningful dialogue between what has been described in Canada as the "two solitudes," far less in maintaining tolerance -- which seems to be a universal problem. Again, everything is not necessarily sweet and lovely in national relationships across the 49th parallel, either. But if more knowledge is required in Canada in the creation of mutual understanding between the two major ethnic groups, or again in sorting out the growing societal complexities governing Canadian-American relations, how can we hope to achieve tolerance and understanding in a rapidly shrinking world by continuing to accept, if not actually foster, ignorance between Western and non-Western civilizations?

To paraphrase Mrs. Pankhurst, who reportedly referred to God by the pronoun "She," if we're going to divide planetary history into East and "non-East" (which is surely just as justifiable as thinking in such exclusive terms as West and non-West), the question still remains, how much of Eastern Europe, for example, do you intend to include in "non-Eastern" history? Prof. Bruun made the point that Barraclough has uttered some pretty strong strictures on the subject of how distortedly the Western strand within Western civilization itself has been emphasized. Now, how much time are you going to find in your course on Western civilization to give to the Slavic world -- even assuming you don't pay the kind of attention that Moscow, the "Third Rome," believes is necessary? In other words, there will always be a problem of coverage, no matter how one attempts to structure any kind of survey course, but acceptance of this inherent difficulty in no way justifies excising materials relating to the non-Western strand. Given the kind of world in which we live, and the very real danger of a mounting "cold war" between the developed economies of the West and the "submerged" economies of the East, I might well argue that what the student today needs is not re-exposure to the Western story at the college level but primary exposure to the Eastern story.

Dean Schaefer: Don't you agree, though, while it would be wonderful to look at the four valleys that were mentioned, again, don't you have to prepare the teacher in advance? But at the moment there are few such people, and to try to talk about a course in an ideal situation when there are no teachers to teach it, may be futile.

Prof. Taylor: Prof. Schaefer, when the text in world civilizations was written there was virtually nobody equipped to teach it. Today, there are more than a few, thanks to almost three decades of the existence of the world-strand approach, and events since the Second World War are accelerating interest -- and expertise -- in the planetary approach. -- I think the problem really goes back to the secondary level. Perhaps, if necessary, we need better survey courses in high school.

Dean Schaefer: So that there will be a greater knowledge built up before the college course?

Prof. Taylor: Exactly.

Prof. Wallbank: I don't really think it is too difficult to train effective teachers on the freshman level for a reasonably accurate and meaningful history of the world. There is so much material that we have now. Many of these books are condensations, of course. By judicious reading in a relatively short period of time, if a young college or university teacher wants to give a world civilization course, I don't think it is at all an insuperable problem. Five or six good books and, of course, a continuing interest in the area can prepare a man to do a good job. In fact, I sometimes believe that if you don't know anything about a subject, but are really determined to become a successful teacher, you do very much better than the specialist does.

Dean Schaefer: You sound like a professor of education. (Laughter)

Prof. Taylor: Why should the historian be excluded from this problem? In political science and economics today, our graduate students are having to learn an entirely new vocabulary, new terms of input-output concepts with regard to the way in which governments operate. Most of the graduate students with whom I am acquainted, in both economics and political science, are learning to acquire new tools that were unknown before World War II. Well, why should the historians be allowed to contract out of a little cerebration?

Prof. John L. Snell: There is a certain amount of illogic involved in what we are saying. How many of us would be at all content to turn over the teaching of high-school courses in history to the football coach on the assumption that he can learn what he doesn't know?

Prof. Wallbank: But that is not a fair comparison.

Prof. Snell: I think it may be.

Prof. Wallbank: Most physical education majors have not been particularly active in the field of humanities. (Laughter)

Prof. Strayer: It seems to me that we are getting a little confused here on one point, and this is that no matter how your course is organized you can teach only one thing at a time. It is a little like moving a wood pile. You can't pick up the whole thing in your arms and carry it five hundred paces. No matter how your course is organized, at one moment you are going to be concentrating, say, on the development of Western science, and at another moment you may be considering the development of Chinese philosophy. There is going to be a separation in time, in other words, between any two topics, whether they are East or West, Europe or non-Europe. The problem is whether you've got to pick up one log and carry it five paces and then go back and get another log and carry it five paces, or whether it is all right to take a number of the logs most of the way and then go back and get your next group. There is just no conceivable way of simultaneously teaching all the different things that you want to teach.

Here I come back to the idea that the important thing which you get out of history is being able to make connections; that is, one isolated historical idea or fact, whatever it is, is no good unless it can be related to another one, and the more of those connections you can make, the better off you are. It helps a lot to have one big body of knowledge to which things can be connected, with which parallels can be drawn and differences can be seen. This is where I would agree with Prof. Perkins. Gain a pretty solid foundation in one civilization, and the obvious one is our own, and then the others will make more sense. If you know the early Middle Ages you do know something about the problems of a pre-industrial society, a society in which democracy did not and could not work, a society which had a completely different set of values from our own. This makes it easier for you when you run into another society which is pre-industrial and undemocratic, and which has a different set of values. The only trouble is that some of our students aren't going to have the time to go through the whole gamut. They aren't going to do it, no matter what tricks we use. I think we should make the material available to them, but I don't think we should fool ourselves that they are going to absorb it all.

Prof. Bruun: I have a feeling that this is where I came in. It seems to me that I heard this entire dialogue back in 1931 when Harry Elmer Barnes had been arguing that history should be written to include sociology, the findings of the anthropologist, and, of course, more on art; and the answer given was almost unanimous: it couldn't be done. Well, in the course of the next twenty years a great deal of this new material was woven in, and as a result our history texts expanded to a thousand pages. The arguments were almost identical, that these were different dialogues, that you could not intertwine. It would be like mingling Chinese music and Western music: all you would get would be hopeless discord.

The argument was not valid then, and I'm wondering just how valid it is now: whether the obstacles we are tripping over are not just in our own minds.

Prof. Maier: Would there be any case for a departmental specialist in Eastern civilizations? Most of us are specialists in the West.

Prof. Wallbank: I think it would be desirable, but I think the man that is wanted today will be very difficult to find.

Prof. Buss: We have a very real problem. We have twenty-two sections of Western civilization, and I don't see how any specialist could divide himself by twenty-two.

Prof. Maier: He would have to cover the East only during a series of general lectures, I suppose. -- One interesting, integrated world approach is being made by Prof. Leften Stavrianos of Northwestern University. You may know of his global history format. We invited Prof. Stavrianos to this conference, but he was one of the very, very few who could not attend.

Prof. Smith: I cannot understand how it is that a young instructor, so strong, so brilliant, could not read a chapter in Wallbank and Taylor and come, at least, to some semblance of understanding greater than that of his students, and leave them, not with full loaves, but with several crumbs of facts and interpretations that would be reasonably accurate. Perhaps my genius is of a different kind from that of your instructors, or perhaps I have more courage. Give me a book on the Ganges, give me a book on the Mauryan Empire, and give me a few hours, and I'll walk into a freshman class and what I tell them may not be right (laughter), but believe you me, they'll carry away a series of impressions that may last them far into the night.

Prof. Strayer: I don't think the question is so much the training of the instructor; I think this can be done. The question is whether this is a good way to teach history. I don't think we have solved that problem.

Prof. Maier: Perhaps we could suspend discussion on the non-Western world for now. We can resume it during that elastic session at the end of the conference which calls for concluding discussion. Is this agreeable?

We continue now with an analysis of deficiencies in present history of civilization courses. What are the complaints? Are they justified? How and where can the course be improved? To discuss such questions, we have assembled a rather formidable panel consisting of Professors Alfred Kelly, Eric Cochrane, John Snell, and Richard Sullivan. Prof. Kelly.

Prof. Kelly: Let me try to cast this in the light of a chairman, at one time, of such a course, and now a chairman of a department who has to harmonize professors who are sometimes at each others' throats on these very questions we have been discussing.

I've listed eight dilemmas which I think make their appearance in such courses and which are often reflected within the context of textbooks themselves. -- Forgive me for such a crass observation: some of the textbooks are authored by some of the men around this table. -- But let me begin with one or two preliminary observations.

In the first place, you have got to have something you can teach to mass man in the modern vast university. We perhaps represent different kinds of institutions here. Princeton is a very different kind of institution from Wayne State University, which is a very different kind of institution, let's say, from one of the rising Negro colleges in the South. Our institution, Claude, is a very different one from Stanford. So you have to have something you can communicate, and if a course, however brilliant a synthesis it is, can't be communicated, there you have pedagogical failure. That's one point I bring to bear on the recent discussion here.

The second preliminary idea is one that you don't necessarily need to accept at all; it is a concept of what we try to work with. History is essentially a synthetic discipline, as far as I am concerned; that is, its peculiar genius lies in its syncretism. The historian is an amateur literary specialist, an amateur sociologist, an amateur political scientist, and so on, but he is a professional historian because history is greater than the sum of all its parts. That observation, I think, could be defended at fair length. History is essentially a syncretistic discipline. Now, if you accept that proposition you are not really trying to teach about literature; you're trying to teach history which is a valid intellectual construct in itself, in which literature may enter. In our course we try to teach history as such, that is, something more than all these specialized disciplines.

Now, let me play with some of these dilemmas. I said that I had eight of them. I'm sure that with a little assistance from you I could get thirty, but this is not bad, I think, for a start. One dilemma is the one we played with so much here: the history of civilization versus the history of civilizations. About eleven years ago, we had a violent argument at Wayne along almost exactly the lines of this discussion. It resulted in our deciding to teach a history of civilizations as such. We had two difficulties which, I think, were nearly fatal. The first one was that of staff, and in spite of Goldwin's bold prognosis, we had staff difficulties and still do with this. The difficulty with history as a syncretistic discipline, to go back to my original observation, is that most historians don't have syncretistic minds. (Laughter) This particular difficulty shows up in this kind of course in an almost fatal way. The other difficulty that arises is pedagogical: that a course of this kind begins to develop synthetic ideas which become more and more removed from what might be called orthodox content. Now, this almost is a values question. What you do is to present the student with a new intellectual construct of which the professor has to say to himself, "This is more important than that which I used to call 'Western civilization'." It seems to me that at last you are really confronted with something you can't solve as an absolute problem of an empirical kind, but rather with a values question of whether this new intellectual construct is more significant, more valuable than this other intellectual construct. I would absolutely agree with those who say that this intellectual construct is feasible. I would also insist, however, that it is extremely difficult to find anybody to teach it, and also that it tends to be very far removed from the construct of what we have familiarly known as the history of Western culture. That it can be done I would insist on.

A second dilemma which has appeared here very briefly, at least, is the dilemma of frame. Now, the old-time course was a political course, and nobody worried about this problem very much. There was a certain outline of politics and you taught it. This was sometimes worked over a bit in terms of the cultural frame, but that is all. I think I am a bit reactionary on this subject, as against some of you who are in favor of a totally cultural frame. Our experience in the course has been something like this: if you are going to produce an adequate political-cultural synthesis -- and I return to the basic idea of our course: that history is syncretistic, that it has to be a syncretistic discipline -- you must have some pegs to put in the wall to hang the garments on. That's a poor metaphor, but I don't quite know what to put in its place. There has to be something the student starts out with, from which he moves. Very often, state history, history as past politics, is the easiest way to do this. Now, this kind of history has an end in itself? I would say, no. But a political frame can be used as a kind of a beginning of navigation -- I am adopting a different metaphor -- you were docked here and you navigate from here; this is the ocean and you know where your ship is. This is not a bad way of organizing material, providing you don't allow this process to subvert you. My own classroom experience goes to the proposition that if you teach a kind of "state history" -- providing you are extremely careful not to allow this to subvert you into what, let's say, Robinson did, or a highly particularistic book like Palmer's (which I think is a very good and at the same time a very bad book; we use it out of despair) -- so that you allow this political frame of reference to be the point of departure for cultural synthesis, then it is very valuable. There is great danger in attempting a cultural synthesis without some kind of a frame.

Now, technology has been suggested here, but I suspect that the difficulty with technology, as a basis for a frame with reference to a particular culture, is that you can't get the pegs into the wall very well; it has no time-space orientation of a sharp enough kind, whereas politics usually has a time-space orientation of a very sharp kind. The student needs this sharper time-space orientation so that he can take hold of it. Now, that in itself could elicit much discussion.

Another dilemma is the Toynbeean dilemma of nation versus culture. This, I think, can be surmounted. In our course, I flatter myself, we have surmounted this. I think there are authors of various textbooks around here that have surmounted what might be called the Toynbeean dilemma. You can treat the state in the 18th century as it emerged and then cite the Prussian, the French, the British (where you will have trouble with it), the Spanish, and so on, as archetypes. You can deal with them as variations of the archetype, or you can select one and get away with this, which we have done in our particular course.

One dilemma which I am surprised that none of you has talked about, however -- and I would address my remarks here in a kind of unpleasant fashion to Professors Wallbank and Taylor -- is the dilemma of cultural segments versus cultural synthesis. Again I return to my basic proposition that history is a syncretistic discipline. If it isn't this, it isn't anything; it's amateur politics, amateur musicology, amateur art, and what not, unless it is something more than all this, unless it is the aggregate of the gross of a culture, and a dynamic portrayal of an evolving culture. If it is an aggregate understanding of a culture and an aggregate of a dynamic culture, then it has achieved something beyond what the economists could do by merely a frame of reference, or what an art historian could do. All of you know histories of economic thought, histories of art, histories of metaphysics, and so on. You must try to do something more than this. Now, too many of these books (and I think this is the possible fault of your books, Gentlemen) in many places break down into a history of cultural segments. Now, I know you have tried to surmount this, but I am thinking in particular of a chapter on the 16th century in one of your books in which we have a little section on medicine, another on the evolution of music, another on literature, and so on. This process, it seems to me, tends to create in the student a kind of confusion. I've seen this again and again, not just in your book, which is excellent in many respects, but in a great many of them the syncretistic process tends to be missed at this point in terms of a series of little packages of Baroque art, of medicine, mathematics, and astronomy. There must be something more than this, otherwise you really are up against the fact that you'd better tell the mathematician to spend a little time talking about Descartes. He probably knows more about it than you do. Now, your reply to this has to be, "But I know Descartes in relation to Baroque culture, and the mathematician does not know Descartes in relation to Baroque culture." Therefore, you must discuss not a little package about Descartes, not a little package about the evolution of the Copernican hypothesis; these things are not what you are talking about. I admit this is a dilemma, because the humanist will come back at you and say, "Ah, but our student doesn't really know anything about mathematics in the 17th century." And I think the answer is, "No, he doesn't." He knows the history, he knows a certain conceptual framework of history of the 17th century. You can't teach him anything about mathematics in the 17th century, and some of these courses go to pieces on that particular difficulty. This is one of the things on which we have seen one young instructor after another go to pieces. He can't see the synthesis, but tries to teach these packages, and he doesn't have anything left when he teaches the packages, because he isn't really a musicologist, let us say, and he doesn't really know anything about the history of medicine and he won't, not even after he reads Wallbank and Taylor.

Another dilemma that shows up in these books is the dilemma of history as Being versus Becoming. We wrote a book once upon a time which tried to deal with this problem, and it was a magnificent failure. I think I would insist on both words; it certainly was a commercial failure. It had one very steady adoption: by a certain coincidence, the Wayne History Department adopted it. (Laughter) One of my friends in the English Department read it and said, "This is really a fine book you fellows have written, but one thing bothers me: historians always deal with the cause of everything, but they don't deal with anything." That is, things are always in process; you are eternally dealing with "what are the causes of this or that" -- the rise of capitalism, for example, but you never get to capitalism. Bourgeois society is always emerging, but where is bourgeois society? (Laughter) This was his basic criticism. What he was striking at was this dilemma of the historian of Being and Becoming.

I think the historian has to strike some kind of reasonable compromise between Being and Becoming in the historical process. My answer would be, not to go overboard and abandon the process of Becoming, but there are certain areas in which you have to treat history as Being, and I think you lose something if you don't apply the synthetic process to certain areas in which history is Being. One of these, I think, is Periclean Athens. Another, is Augustan Rome. I would treat both Periclean Athens and Augustan Rome in terms of Being and Becoming. Another would be, let's say, the High Middle Ages, which I would treat both in terms of Being and Becoming. Another would be the 17th century, which I think is terrifically important in terms of understanding contemporary culture -- I would even argue that civilization in a modern sense came out of this. I think you have to teach a course in such a way that the instructor deals part of the time with the process of Becoming, but from time to time abandons this role of Becoming and deals with the process of Being. I don't see that the historian should apologize for the fact that at certain points he pauses and deals with the process of Being in terms of synthesis.

Now we argued a little bit earlier about this question of continuity and discontinuity in history. A very simple solution to this, it seems to me, is that again you have to accept both ideas. You have to deal with Periclean Athens in terms of the eternal, and I think this can be done. But you also have to deal with Greece according to the Shelleyan observation, Greece as "that point of life in history" in which certain ideas burst upon man that have a contemporary meaning. I don't see how anybody can talk in class, even briefly, about Plato's Republic without realizing that these ideas have a contemporaneous character; at least a great many of them do. I mean the dilemmas that are housed in the debate between Socrates and Thrasymachus about the nature of the state. If that isn't an introduction to the character of totalitarianism, I don't know what is. I think that history can be made meaningful in terms of continuity as well as eternity, within that frame of reference, and I think the instructor must do it, and he must have some understanding of this process.

There is, I think, a danger in teaching the course merely as a way of saying, "Now, this is a way in which you understand contemporary social science." History is not a social science. To say this doesn't denigrate social science as a discipline. It may be a kind of social science, but it isn't economics or political science or sociology in this sense, and neither is it linguistics, for example. I remember that old Breasted textbook which attempted to teach the history of Egypt in part by embarking on a little linguistic inquiry into the emergence of the alphabet, which was fine as a part of the study of the Egyptian culture, but I thought, at the time, it got off the track in terms of its attempt to do something functional with linguistics as such. This, I think, you can't do in a course of this kind. Your course is not really inductive to the abstract ideas of the social sciences, even though there will be a "carry-over." Again, it is history as synthesis for history in itself.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I've given you seven or eight ideas, and I have given you a certain approach to these. I would end up by putting it this way (and this goes, I think, for our more advanced courses as well as our world civilization course), you can't sell any course at Wayne to our students any longer or make them believe it if you don't provide an intellectual construct. A course of this kind must abandon the old particularistic, inductive, historical process and use facts in terms of an intellectual construct. If you do this within the notion of synthesis and syncretism, which are not quite the same thing, and if you resolve these dilemmas by recognizing that they are dilemmas and that you have to deal with both sides of them, I think you get a course which you might describe, when you get through, as a glorious failure which the faculty will fight over constantly, but which may be one of the really inspiring centers of academic excitement on a campus. That's what it has been for us.

Prof. Cochrane: Luckily, Mr. Kelly has covered a number of the points that I was thinking of covering myself. I am pleased to find that two different institutions can come up with so many of the same judgments. I should also state that my own experience is, to some extent, limited; limited by my experience at the University of Chicago. I thought, probably, during the course of the session I would illustrate my limitations by putting out on the table some of the materials we use in the course at the University of Chicago, so that you can see the sort of thing we are dealing with. It is the kind of University that is somewhat different from others, and it doesn't pose nearly the same problems as one faces at a larger university like Western Michigan, since we have a very small undergraduate college and a rather large graduate department, and hence a rather large faculty in proportion to the number of students. There are only a little over 2,000 students, and the History Department has some 35 to 40 members. Obviously, a number of the problems that would arise are not particularly applicable in this situation.

First, I would like to suggest, as others have in the course of our discussion, that in many cases the so-called history of civilization courses expect too much or expect to do too much. Now, I am assuming here a particular definition that I gather is not common to other members of the panel; that is, that the history of civilization is basically a course in history -- that is, it is an introduction to a particular discipline. I would suggest that history ought to be defined not according to the matter it deals with but the kind of questions it asks. History, and I simply pose this as a possible definition, should seek first of all to give a sense of temporal connection among individual events. This is the principle that we talked about at some length. It ought also to give a sense of change through time; this is another point that has been made.

I would like to add to these two points that, I think, history ought also to give an appreciation of the value of the single phenomenon as opposed to a category or an abstract concept. Again, here is a reflection of my own experience, since most of our students, being involved in an institution that is highly Aristotelian, tend to think almost exclusively in terms of abstracts. When they enter the introductory course to history, most of them are absolutely shocked to realize that individual phenomena can be considered as individual phenomena, and that these phenomena can be related in a historical way, but not in an absolute way, to other phenomena. It is a rather deep concept that bears certain further clarification. In other words, I think, that to some extent the good old-fashioned discipline of philology may be one of the greatest studies of history even today. There may be some point in giving the students a concept of what some people call the historically contingent. A good example is one that was brought up a few minutes ago, a concept like liberty. I think it is very healthy for students eventually to learn that when Saint Paul says liberty, or the Vulgate says liberty, when Pericles or Cicero or Thomas Jefferson use a similar expression, they mean quite different things, and that these words are not signs for an abstract concept that can be drawn down from heaven upon call, but that these concepts or words used in particular circumstances are the products of the circumstances in which they appear. The meanings of these words, these expressions, these concepts change enormously from one place to another. This, to me, is one of the most important objects of historical discipline and one that the kind of course I am speaking about ought to seek to incorporate.

Finally, I would suggest that history might also consider as one of its proper objectives the inculcation of a sense of human freedom from the immediate or more general historical past. This is a common idea and doesn't need to be gone into in any detail. Consequently, my criticisms are based on the assumption that the course we are speaking of seeks these particular objectives, and I gather this is not an assumption that is terribly widespread among all of us here. I suggest then that one of the difficulties is that introductory history courses tend to cover a lot of disciplines that are not properly a part of the historical discipline I have just outlined. Histories of civilization tend to become hodge-podges of many different disciplines, and the poor historian who teaches them is expected to be competent in literary criticism, in abstract philosophy, and in a number of other things that might possibly be better handled by other people. I look with disfavor upon history courses that are conceived largely in terms of a great books course in which the teacher of such a course, being a historian, is expected to arrive at general principles concerning the nature of literature, principles upon which a play of Shakespeare's could be judged, and the like. This simply is not a historian's role, and I think it would probably be far better if this sort of thing were left to other people. In other words, the introductory history course ought not be asked to do the job of general education. General education as conceived in most universities is something far more important than just history. History forms a historical outlook and a historical approach. It forms an intimate part, needless to say, of a general education, but there is no reason why the poor history department must be responsible for general education while colleagues in the English department, in the Romance language, philosophy, and science departments quietly go on teaching their own upper-division and graduate courses.

This may be one of the difficulties involved in staffing such a course.

In defining history as a way of looking at things, I wonder if it is really advisable to attempt to cover any particular time span; that is, to cover five thousand years or even two thousand or one thousand years in the brief span of three quarters or two semesters. The University of Chicago history course attempts an approach very similar to that outlined by Mr. Kelly. It investigates in some detail certain periods of historical development of the West. It chooses the West because generally among these periods of investigation in some detail there are certain connections, and the connections can be seen in the investigation of the period. Hence, again I would heartily applaud the suggestion that rather than covering everything between Periclean Athens and Augustan Rome, it might be far more profitable to go deeply into Periclean Athens and include everything from Homer on down, as a way of explaining the development of this particular moment in history. Similarly, the early Roman Republic would serve to explain the kind of civilization that occurred in Rome during the Early Augustan Age.

One attempt to solve some of these problems was made some time ago at the University of Chicago, and I gather it has been done at other institutions as well. History has been called upon to act as a synthesis for a bunch of other disciplines. This puts the introductory course not in the freshman year, but in the senior year, and students then having spent some time learning about the social sciences, the natural sciences, biological science, and what not, then hang all these things together on the tree -- if you don't mind my taking down the coat hangers -- in a chronological orientation which used to rhyme at the University of Chicago with a philosophical or abstract orientation. This doesn't work very well, because other instructors are brought into a historical course who are not historically trained or are not interested in asking historical questions. This was an experiment that was tried, and simply didn't work out very well.

In regard to my basic criticism that history is asked to do too much, I also find it rather difficult to approach the whole world, that is, to try to take into consideration different historical traditions. I'll admit that there are interactions among various civilizations, and it is not for nothing that my office is next door to that of my colleague, Bill McNeill, who has made this his specialization. In this case I would suggest that it would be far better, with the qualifications I have given a moment ago, to approach a single civilization. Now, in the abstract it doesn't make too much difference whether you take the Chinese civilization, Latin America, or Africa, or what not. My own concern is that Western history may be somewhat easier to deal with, first of all, because it presents this time sequence, this idea of change, this constant development through time.

Most students we deal with at Chicago have absolutely no idea of time. They live in an atemporal world. If the historical discipline that is presented to them is one with which they have no contact, which they cannot see realized concretely in any part of their own particular environment, then this idea of development in time will remain a category completely separate from everything else they do. This is one justification, I think, for offering Western civilization rather than another. My point is still the same, however, that a single, continuing, historical vision is much more successful in instilling in the students' minds an idea of time and an appreciation of things that move in a temporal sequence. There are a couple of other justifications for a course in Western civilization, but Mr. Strayer has already mentioned them.

Secondly, I think that history is very often taught by the wrong people. It seems to me that basically a course in civilization is a history course, and it ought to be taught by a historian. It ought to be taught, not by a specialist in "world civilization" as a whole, but by one who is involved at the same time in a very thorough investigation of one particular aspect of history. I am not afraid of the specialist, or the so-called research scholar. Indeed, I am convinced on my own very brief experience that he who does a certain amount of very specialized research turns out to be the best teacher of a general course. There are a few cases where this is not necessarily true, but I think the instructor who is actively engaged in constructive historical thought in a particular area is a far better teacher of a more general history course.

This is another justification for the teaching of Western civilization as the introductory history course: it is also important that the teacher know at least the principal scholarly languages in which the most recent works on the subjects he is dealing with are written. Now, it is helpful, of course, to know Greek or Latin if you are dealing in that era, but at least German, French, Italian, or whatever else is particularly necessary.

The wrong kind of people who often teach these courses are: first, a man who is handed the job as a kind of personal specialization, that is, one who simply directs a course of this sort. I'm not sure that this works very well. It is much more profitable if such courses be taught on a collegial basis, rather than one man taking over the task of teaching Western civilization and getting other people to do the work for him. I don't believe in a hierarchy in this case; I believe in cooperation among equals.

I think it is not a very good idea to have a course of this sort taught by a new instructor; it ought not be a purgatory for the new man who comes in. I think that a more mature man, one who has had far more experience, who has read more deeply in history and has given it far more thought, makes a far better instructor for such a course. I would, therefore, turn the whole thing upside down and ask the student who has just finished his dissertation to begin his teaching career by offering a graduate seminar in the particular field of his specialty, and hope that the mature scholar would take an interest in teaching something for which, I think, he is far better prepared. I again would repeat the sense of horror that I expressed this morning that this sort of course be taught by a graduate student, who, I think, is the least competent of all. I think this is dangerous for the graduate assistant, and I think it is not fair to the undergraduate students to be exposed to one in whom they seldom have very much confidence.

Furthermore, I might add from my own personal experience, that freshly graduated Ph.D.'s who are shuffled into a large course in Western civilization without too much contact with their senior colleagues in the department often feel very lost and in a hopelessly inferior position. This is not healthy for a growing intellect.

I also think that these courses are often taught by the wrong methods. Lectures, in my own opinion, are not a very efficient way of teaching the kind of course that is offered at the very beginning. This sort of course ought to be taught via "discussion section" -- again, this is a bad expression because it has been so abused in practice -- sections in which there is free give and take between teacher and student; that is, active discussion planned out in advance by the teacher on a particular document, especially the kind of source material provided in such great abundance in a number of publications today. This, I think, is where the instruction should be centered. This is the sort of thing that will stick in the student's mind above all, particularly if you are trying to get across a historical approach. Lectures, therefore, serve merely as fringe decorations and ought not be considered the center of the course as a whole.

I might add that I, myself, have a horror of staff meetings, which don't very often turn out to be an opportunity for intellectual exchange, because most people who teach these courses know each other anyway. They tend to get bogged down in details about how to run examinations and how to count up grades. I really find them an immense waste of time. I could go on with this because I am rather bitter on the subject. I might say, in my own honor, that I have gotten rid of staff meetings on history courses at the University of Chicago.

I think, in other words, we should try to emphasize a direct relationship between a teacher and a student, which, as I pointed out, is possible when you have classes of twenty-five and a large faculty. Obviously, if your classes are much larger than that and only a small number of teachers are available, my criticisms become somewhat less important.

Finally, I think sometimes we teach with the wrong materials. There has been a certain amount of experimentation at the University of Chicago. We have generally found, and I am convinced, that textbooks are not very good for realizing the kind of objectives I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation. I would much prefer a thorough discussion of particular documents from various moments of the past, carefully collected and edited with the help of somebody who knows something about them. I am expecting a lot from the instructor. This is why I hope you will stay in the Western tradition. I expect that he at least keeps up with the latest monographs on the subjects he is dealing with. This means that he has got to have colleagues who are in different fields of history because they, although they need not furnish him with the results of the monographic work, at least read the scholarly reviews and pick out the latest book or article on the subject of the Roman Republic. So, the poor man whose real specialty is the 19th century need not follow all the reviews, but can at least read the latest monograph on Julius Caesar and Cicero, so that when he comes around to discussing Cicero's Republic with his students, he can at least present to them the most current interpretation.

Prof. Richard Sullivan: We now have the age-old method of Prof. Kelly and Prof. Cochrane's dualism. Perhaps I can take a trinitarian position in keeping with the Western theme. (Laughter)

When we start talking about problems and deficiencies, I really agree with the point that Prof. Kelly made: that when we talk on this, we get into the profound problem of the very nature of history itself. What I would like to do is talk to a very practical point, if I may. I'd like to suggest what I think are three basic difficulties connected with history of civilization courses as they are taught today, not the theoretical "ideal" course, but the practical way they work out, especially in institutions where a large number of students are involved. The three very grave difficulties which I think you Gentlemen should look into, in your inquiries on this problem, are these: first of all, I think the history of civilization course demands of the instructor the burden of presenting a version of the past for which he has no real conviction, by virtue primarily of new ideas of history that have come into being in fairly recent times.

Secondly, I think that the difficult history of civilization course, as it works out in practice, involves the student in an intellectual operation in which he has no interest.

Thirdly, I think that the history of civilization course requires of the student a range of skills for which he has no previous training, for which he is really not prepared. Now, all three problems, I suspect, are capable of being overcome, but they are, I think, inherent in the way history of civilization courses actually work out.

Now, let me expand on these briefly; first, the proposition that the history of civilization courses demand of an instructor involvement in a kind of operation for which he has no conviction. In practical experience -- teaching, classroom procedures, and so forth -- the typical history of civilization course really centers around a particular concept about the nature of the historical process and use of history. I think it assumes, in the final analysis, that the historical process is one of accretion, whereby humanity operates in a temporal framework to achieve a level of culture which immediately gives way to a new level of culture, but that through time we keep getting better and better and better. This is the direction the course really takes when you start teaching it. In essence, then, you really teach this course as if we still believe that we are working inevitably from the slime to the best of all possible worlds, which is the present. This, I think, is the spirit that presides in a typical classroom with a typical instructor and a typical student body. (I exclude all the courses represented here, of course!) In practice, then, what you are really imposing on the instructor in such a course is the obligation of teaching some idea of the progress of man through a span of time, in which the dross of human experience is cast aside from time to time and something better is evolved.

Now, I submit that most of us find this basically objectionable: we no longer believe in that kind of history. I need not labor this particular point. We have talked around the table today of a dozen different points of view toward history -- comparative civilizations and the like -- that really excite us as teachers but with which we never get to do anything in this course. The result is, then, that the typical instructor, no matter how great his enthusiasm might be at the beginning of such a course, is very soon put off by being involved in what seems to him to be a basically dishonest operation: trying to impress upon the student that we got the way we are now, which is the best we can be, of course, by going through this step, this step, this step, and this step. This is something that is not intellectually attractive to the instructor.

Now, this brings me to the second grave problem which I think affects these courses, and that is the student's quandary in this situation. He is in the presence of an instructor who is basically at odds with what he is doing, intellectually speaking. Now, when this happens the instructor begins to play a little trick on the student. He begins to transform the course, in a sense, into something which, it seems to him, may ultimately be more valuable. He begins to, what I would call, professionalize the material. He uses this course as the beginning step, I think, for the training of a professional historian. As the average person teaches such a course more, he gradually comes to be concerned primarily with the professional historian's problems, that is, making sure that the student understands the time periods which are involved amongst historians, the technical vocabulary that rules over the profession at the particular moment, and worst of all (and we have had a tremendous blizzard of this sort of thing lately), what various opinions of various historians are on a particular problem. I fear at this present juncture that we are no longer going to teach history at all. We are going to teach what historians think. That is the way the textbooks or the additional reading materials seem to be shaping up. -- Step by step, then, the typical student finds himself in the presence of an instructor who is saying, in effect, "I will now acquaint you with the foundations of history, and the day will come when you can learn more when you take other courses in history." This is the first step in a process of professionalization of the subject matter.

Now, what this really amounts to in the mind of the student, I think, is to completely dishearten him. For the great bulk of them there is no more. This is all the history they are going to get. The result is that when they are confronted again and again with the basic proposition, whether stated or implicit, that you can't understand this from what I am saying -- you have to wait until you study this period more, they throw up their hands in despair and lose all interest in the course.

Now, this is presuming that we have good students; but my third point is that I don't even think we have that, which makes the problem even worse. We ought to take seriously the fact that our students come to us basically lacking the skills required in studying our course, however we construct it. They come to us really not capable, I think, of doing what we expect of them. I think this is a problem that needs much greater investigation. I do not pretend to talk definitively on it; I'm just going to make several suggestions which I think are pertinent.

I believe that if one really examined the typical history of civilization course -- any history course for that matter, but especially this one -- he would find that certain kinds of intellectual operations were required of the student. For instance, we really require them to memorize a great many discrete facts, and this is true of any history of civilization course. We require them to read expository material and understand it. We require of them an ability to reason in various categories, by comparison and contrast, by precise definition, by change of causal relationships, and so forth. We demand of them a time-sense right from the beginning. We demand from them, incidentally, an ability to write in expository fashion so that they can make clear that they understand what we have said. I do not believe, from my own experience, that most of our students come to us with these kinds of skills. We are asking them, in other words, to do something that is really impossible for them because of their training. If I understand the way high-school courses are conducted, I think that some of these skills are slighted rather badly. The ability to read extensively on one's own, for instance, is a skill that I don't believe is acquired in high school. I don't think that dealing with precise information is acquired from a high-school education, especially in the field of social science. I could go on with this for some time, but my basic point is this: we get into grave difficulties with our typical course, our typical textbooks, our typical reading assignments, and so forth, because in these you are asking the students to perform intellectual operations for which they are really not prepared and cannot become prepared fast enough to master what we are trying to do in this tremendous undertaking called history of civilization.

What I am really suggesting then, I think, is this: that a study such as you Gentlemen are undertaking should try to point out some of the assumptions that are actually worked from in these courses. Whatever we say we want to do, we ought to have some research device whereby we could get down to what is really happening in the courses. I believe that these issues would be fundamentally important to such an investigation.

Prof. Snell: It is difficult to feel that one has anything else to say at this point. -- I would like to suggest first, the chief characteristics of what I consider to be good teaching of history at the college level and, at least by implication, what I believe to be the kind of history courses college students should be taught. Only after doing that will I give my views on the college-level history of civilization course. If this approach seems somewhat tedious and roundabout, I would suggest that no one here should expect anything more direct from a history teacher who has been spoiled by deaning for a year and a half. (Laughter)

Good college teaching of history demands many qualities in the instructor and in the conditions of the course. One that has been sufficiently emphasized, I believe, off and on all day, is that the instructor and the course must somehow manage to get across to the students a time concept, an awareness of history as process, an awareness of change. I confess at the outset that I believe that the history of civilization course does get this concept of time, process, and change across. But it seems to me that the supreme test of good college teaching of history is whether it raises questions in the minds of the students and accustoms them to grappling with questions to develop powers of analysis. Only a minority of our students from many of our institutions, I think, will develop this power of critical analysis to a very high degree of sophistication. And to that I would add that I suspect that only a minority of our students need to. I think society can get along reasonably well with a critically analytical minority. A great majority of our students, on the other hand, can be brought to understand that there are many enduring questions about the past, and they can be stimulated to an awareness of these questions, to a higher level of curiosity about the past than they had when they came to our courses. Furthermore, they can be made more responsible citizens by being made aware that they have not gotten all the answers about the past of mankind.

This questing approach to history can be developed most directly, I think, by the instructor simply confronting the students with some of the enduring questions about periods, movements, and individuals of the past. It will develop spontaneously within the minds of individual students if the instructor -- through his own lectures, textbooks, and parallel reading -- confronts the students with detail in sufficient depth to cause them to sense for themselves the contradictions and inadequacies of the answers we historians have provided about the past. Getting across the questing approach to the student is terribly important, however it may be done.

What are the other essential qualities of the effective college teacher of history and the courses he offers? I submit that both the instructors and the courses need to convey to the students an awareness in some depth of such things as multiple causation in history; of the complex character of every period and movement in history; and, therefore, of what I would call the ambiguous legacies every historical movement leaves to the next and later historical period. In other words, besides developing a questing approach, the good college teacher and good college course in history should leave students convinced that whatever the answers are about the past, they are not simple.

Now, in my considered opinion, teachers of history of civilization courses do not and cannot possess in desirable degree the qualities that I have described as essential. A prerequisite for asking pertinent and concrete questions is a large and deep body of knowledge over which the individual has given a very considerable amount of thought. Obviously, this is a prerequisite to teaching multiple causation and the complexity of the historical period or the ambiguous legacies of major movements in periods of history. But what teacher of the civilization course has, when he begins (or, I would have to ask, can develop even in five or ten years) that kind of knowledge for more than rather small segments of the totality that he is expected to teach? Even if he develops the needed sophistication, or if we fall back on a team of experts to teach the course, how -- in the time allowed for each segment of the course -- can the job be done on students that my four-way set of values suggests needs to be done?

But worse still, even if the instructional problem somehow can be solved in the best way imaginable, how can the student problem be solved? The student does not have time and cannot find time in the year, while carrying four or more other academic courses simultaneously, to become anything more than a dilettante in something that we might call history of civilization or even the history of Western civilization. Our colleagues in the sciences know better than to try such a thing. I suspect that even we would shrink from a two-term course in science for college freshmen. The course would attempt to cover astronomy, botany, chemistry, geology, mathematics, physics, and zoology -- not to mention the many other derivations from these sciences. I hope we would shrink from this course. It seems to me that such a course in science would produce superficiality, something really unworthy of college-level instruction. It would be a throwback to the days of natural philosophy courses; yet we continue with the history of civilization course, which is something fairly comparable. We are, in effect, trying to teach moral philosophy, to give it an 18th-century label. I submit it is not and cannot be good anthropology, sociology, music, political science, or science -- not to mention all the other things that it includes -- much less, history.

The conclusion I reach is implicit in what I have said, and I am now ready to make it explicit. Instead of trying to improve the health of the college-level history of civilization course, we should give it as decent and as quiet a burial as faculty relationships permit. We might hope that the high schools would continue to give it. We in the colleges can hope and assume that many of our students will gain through such a high-school course perspective and awareness of time and change that will be useful in college-level courses that are somewhat more specialized and thus more appropriate for college-level instruction.

Now, the critic who proposes to eliminate, I think, should be prepared to recommend a replacement for what he proposes to take out. I suggest that we replace the single-option, freshman-level history of civilizations course with a range of possibilities from which each student might choose. We don't have to turn out experts on the whole world civilization. If every fifth person were an expert in the development of modern European civilization, or even American civilization, or Latin-American civilization, it would add up to a very considerably more enlightened citizenry, I think, than what we have. So, I would suggest a range of courses that would at least include broad courses in United States history, medieval history, modern European history, Latin-American history, and Far Eastern history. I think this would go part way toward meeting pedagogical problems that have been noted in connection with the civilization course. I would suggest that a graduate assistant or a new Ph.D. can more adequately teach one of these courses, one in which he has majored on the graduate level. In one of these courses the veteran instructor can more adequately and with greater satisfaction, with less grumbling, continue to teach for years -- drawing from what he has learned from a lifetime of reading in one of these broad areas. In one of these courses, it seems to me, both the young and the older instructor can better relate and enrich the course through research. These courses are still quite broad. They are broad enough to provide the concept of process, change -- broad enough to avoid overly-narrow specialization for freshman students -- and yet they are spatially more restricted than history of civilization courses, so that they can allow the student to develop this questing attitude and the sense of multiple causation, complexity of historical periods, ambiguous legacies of historical movements that I hold to be desirable. Out of the experience of such medium-breadth courses, I believe our freshman students can emerge with greater sophistication, less smugness, and a more abiding appreciation of history as a vital subject in their college curriculum and in their continuing lives.

Prof. Maier: Thank you very much. We shouldn't imagine that Prof. Snell had come in secretly to torpedo our conference! He wrote me in advance that his position would be highly critical, and we urged him to come with precisely this in mind. We need such fundamental criticism of this course, and we certainly welcome it.

At this point, I am sure, you are well primed for discussion of these four presentations. Unfortunately, however, we have exhausted our time and dinner is waiting, so we will resume our conference tomorrow with your reactions to our panelists' presentations. I'm sure that Profs. Wallbank and Taylor may want to answer Prof. Kelly, and there will be other cross firings as well. I would be disappointed if John Snell didn't elicit any reaction. -- If there is no objection, the conference is adjourned until tomorrow morning.

* * *

Prof. Maier: We welcome you back to our conference this morning, Gentlemen. You will note that today there will be fewer formal presentations and far more in the way of good, stimulating discussion, which will be the very heart of our conference.

We now solicit your reactions to yesterday's discussion of the negative qualities, the deficiencies in civilization courses as they are now taught.

Prof. Cochrane: It occurred to me that Mr. Snell's recommendation was not that radical after all, and is substantially in agreement with mine. I was talking about a course that I now realize was not the sort of thing that we ordinarily call "civilization." I was misled by the "history of civilization" and supposed that this had something to do with purely a historical approach. I gather from the comments that were made that most civilization courses are not taught purely historically and therefore do not fall strictly within this category. If you accept my definition of what I thought a history of civilization was, it agrees exactly with what Mr. Snell says; except that my recommendation was a history of Europe from Greece on down, rather than a somewhat more monographical approach to history. That is, Mr. Snell would recommend that instead of offering a general course in European history, we offer a variety of courses to undergraduates in particular areas.

Prof. Perkins: I hate to disagree with Prof. Snell. I don't think that he is wholly wrong, but the course on Western civilization is pretty well embedded in the academic system, now. I don't feel like arguing its propriety, therefore, in theoretical terms. It seems to me that we don't have the choice of dropping it. We have only one opportunity, I think, and that is to improve it. Of course, on the fundamental principles, Prof. Snell and I are in cordial agreement: the quality of this course will depend upon the quality of the preparation of instructors on the graduate level.

Prof. Strayer: As was pointed out by Mr. Cochrane, I think that many of us are not in any great disagreement with Prof. Snell, because many of us feel that the only way you can teach this course is by limiting it in some way; not by trying to get everything in when it becomes merely a set of generalizations without any backstopping. But the one problem I would have is how in the world you can expect students to take a highly specialized course, the sort that Prof. Snell is describing, in the freshman year. I don't think that they are quite ready for that kind of work. On the other hand, we certainly ought to give them something with a little more meat and substance to it than is found in a lot of the present history of civilization courses. The way to do this, I think, is to try to show the connections. This is one of the places where the students are the weakest. You can tell them about one man and what he did, about another man and what he did, and some of them don't even realize that the two lived in the same century. Once in a while, of course, you find one of these remarkable men who gets into four or five activities at the same time, and then it is easy for students to realize that politics, art, literature, and philosophy were all developing at the same time, because they were developing in the life of this one man. Abbot Suger is a good example of that in 12th-century France, but unfortunately you don't find people like that whom you can use as illustrations for every period and every century.

Prof. Smith: When I looked in the mirror this morning, Gentlemen, I thought of a sentence Prof. Bruun uttered a long time ago when we were speaking to the National Council of Social Sciences. The sentence was: "We are the dupes of time and the casualties of progress." Things have indeed changed since we were young undergraduates. In those days we listened to linear lectures that started with the Parthenon and ended with the Park Shelton Hotel. All that we heard was heavily political. It was also very neat. We have some nostalgia for that clear and simple lecture system of the not so long ago. But now, in a lecture of 1964, we draw upon the knowledge provided for us by the archaeologists, the sociologists, the chemists, the physicists, and their fellows from other areas of specialized knowledge. I suggest that this might be a problem for discussion later: how much material made available to us by other disciplines may we include in our world history courses? What about time? What about space? What about these and other questions of structure and craftsmanship? We come to several of these problems as craftsmen. We all make our intellectual constructs in our books and in our classrooms. We all make bulges at certain places in the text and in our lectures, because we think certain issues and men are more important than others. We deliberately stress certain thrusts and controls, because we are artists and craftsmen and we want to leave certain bodies of knowledge and a series of impressions in the classroom and the textbook. Gentlemen here have been quite successful in doing that (Professors Strayer, Sullivan, Bruun, Wallbank and Taylor, and others) and have told their tale in a thousand pages or so. It may be that in our new textbooks of the world of tomorrow there will be less segmentation and dividing and far more emphases upon certain themes, ideas, men, directional thrusts in history. I think that we may still be plagued by the desire to put too much matter-of-fact knowledge into our lectures and our texts today. This passion for putting in too much has been dangerous for a long time. Bishop Berkeley said: "We stir up a cloud of words and complain that we cannot see."

I would be very much interested in hearing from Professors Wallbank, Taylor, Bruun, and others who are here something of their ideas about "guidelines" and the selection controls they have used in their books and have suggested to their quiz masters and lecturers in the large classes they now direct.

Prof. Wallbank: The amount of material, of course, is enormous. When Dr. Taylor and I began planning this book, we were very foolish and young. We didn't realize the terrible complexities and obstacles which have been discussed, for example, at this meeting. We thought we had a job to do, and I don't think it had been done before. Dr. Bruun, of course, had done it more on the Western basis and did a remarkably good job. I had just come back from Africa, and I had this feeling that we had better get our young people prepared to understand not only their contemporary world, but a wider world than we had been talking about, and that was the world of the Afro-Asian people. Of course, as Prof. Sullivan, Smith, Bruun, and others know, the planning of textbooks is a very difficult thing because you do have limitations. These limitations become obvious when you talk to your editor, and it is really very difficult. Now, we tried to produce a book in which the main emphasis, naturally, was upon the Western world because our young people live in a Western culture. At the same time we thought it might be interesting and challenging if at appropriate places in the development of civilization we could insert some reference to the development of these non-Western cultures.

Organization is a very difficult thing; for example, the problems of the 19th century. In one of our editions we had a topical approach in which we tried to follow nationalism, democracy, and so on, right on through. But we found that in general, the users of any such textbook are inclined to be very, very traditional, and I sometimes believe that we as historians have a rigidity, we are afraid to innovate, we are afraid to experiment. By the very nature of our discipline we are wedded to the past, rather than trying to explain the present. I think the connection of past and present is very, very vital, not to the professional historian who can lose himself in the subtleties of the past, but to young people who want to have some idea as to why the present came into being.

As to Dr. Snell's proposals, I would feel that on the freshman level this may be a rather interesting suggestion in some institutions, but for the average young person that comes to the university -- and in many cases, as Dr. Strayer has pointed out, without any world history whatsoever -- to give him a course in, say, medieval history or some other segmented area, without any knowledge of the world configuration of history, would be a rather great step, I think. Of course, I come from California where mass education is a little bit more messy, probably, than in other parts of the country. We have a tremendous volume of students. I often drop into a junior college and sit in a classroom, and these youngsters don't have any background. And I feel that this kind of a general course is all that they can take, and furthermore, of course, they don't take anything else, in most cases, if they are not going to be historians. So I would say, Prof. Snell, that while your suggestion is very stimulating, and possibly with the growth of our educational levels it may become possible for our grandchildren, right now I'm not really enthusiastic about it.

Prof. Snell: I would say, on the contrary, that the more messy the high-school education is, the worse it is to give this kind of course on the freshman level, because it simply adds mess to the mess that has already been presented. Students have been accustomed to the superficial so much that it is essential to break them from it.

Prof. Wallbank: But they don't have anything, you see, and I feel that your approach is specialistic. I may be wrong, of course, and I am so happy to see that in this fraternity of historians we do have a really healthy division of opinion. Now, for example, when Dr. Cochrane talked, to me it was like talking about a situation that didn't exist on this planet, because it must be very, very interesting and, indeed, worthwhile to be in an institution where you can dispense with the lecture and you can dispense with the textbook. But it must be regarded, I think, as a rather atypical and unusual situation, and I am interested in the general problem of the characteristic institution, the average young man, and the average young woman.

I would seem to me that we might have talked a little bit more about what we could do with the non-Western world. While I admit that most institutions probably should content themselves with the Western strand explicitly, at the same time, they might bring in a little bit more of the influence of the Western thrust in terms of colonialism and imperialism, and the changing Afro-Asian world. Our young people somehow, somewhere, at some time have got to be introduced to this. Where this is going to be done I wouldn't know.

Prof. Dunbar: I come back to a point I raised yesterday, and I still hope we will have time to discuss it; and that is the function of the textbook, if one is used, or the readings; the function of the lecture and the function of the discussion period. All of these components are in most of these courses as we present them. Our concern here, it seems to me, is a concern for depth at some point in this course. Is it conceivable that such depth could be attained, at least in some measure, either through reading or through lecture or the discussions? We have been talking about this course as if there were no difference in the way the lectures, the discussions, and the textbook operated. Is it conceivable that breadth could be obtained through the textbook, or through lectures, and that one of the other components might lend an element of depth to this course?

Prof. Wallbank: At the University of Southern California we have had the lecture, the textbook, at times additional supplementary readings, and then the discussion classes. In the discussion classes, I have always found that it is very difficult to get the instructors to understand that these are not just quiz sections in which you answer the students' questions and tell them, "Now, this is important, and you have got to remember this." In other words, discussion questions should be, I think, an opportunity for the student to probe some of the implications of the material, the significance, the implications, the meaning of the material that he has wrestled with. It is always a contest between the student and the graduate instructor, because the student wants the instructor to explain material which he should have got either out of the lecture or out of the book. Dean Raubenheimer really was responsible for the introduction of this course at the University of Southern California. He had a great faith in general education, and he always said that we must not allow the students to come to these classes with the idea that the instructor is going to be a crutch, that he is going to help these people in terms of definitions and understanding the material. The student must be well prepared when he comes to the discussion.

Now, as to the lecture, it has always been a problem in my department to try to get instructors, professors who I feel have the gift of humanization, the spirit and emotion of enthusiasm in presenting their material -- in other words, a professor who likes to explain his material and stimulate interest among freshman students. We haven't had too many men who actually realized the great opportunity that they had. I have always felt in my general lectures that my function is not to add a great deal of detail, but to try to introduce the subject in terms of its significance, its implications, and to stimulate this interest; and I think up to a point I was successful.

Now, as far as the text is concerned, I think in the average collegiate situation a text is very, very necessary. Of course, in Dr. Cochrane's situation where you probably have few students and very good students, you can give them the continuity, you can use different kinds of materials. But you want to understand that classes in most instances are so large.

I felt very happy this year when my class was reduced to two hundred, and this is a very large class, you see. And so you have got to have, I think, a textbook. I feel that the day of the lecture is not over. Some of my fondest memories of my collegiate experience were in terms of some of the great men like Henry Morse Stevens in history, Ira B.Cross in economics, and Holmes in biology. These were great scholars and they kindled in me an interest in their subject, and I think it is a personal thing. Of course, some lecturers are as dry as dust and they do not fulfill, really, any worthwhile function; but if you have great teachers, they perform a magnificent function.

Prof. Maier: A footnote here: what is the ratio between hours dedicated to lecture sections and discussion sections in your course at USC?

Prof. Wallbank: It is four units at the present time, two hours of lectures, one hour of discussion, and then they have interviews and outside reading to make up their four hours.

Dean Schaefer: May I introduce some empirical data into this discussion, partially in support of what Mr. Snell has said and partially in response to your question, Dr. Dunbar. I think there have been many attempts to investigate the amount of learning, amount of information, amount of understanding retained over time in the study of world history. What I have tried to do here is to draw two lines. Consider a time span of world civilization between here and here, and you offer content that covers that time span somehow. That is one kind of approach to the problem: equal emphasis.

Another approach is simply to take the same time span and skip many parts, depending upon a cursory reading of the text or something of that kind for breadth, and then go into depth at three or four points along the course. If you compare students in both systems, invariably those who have had training in depth, even though they have skipped a great deal, will do better on a general test of retention of information and understanding of the whole picture than will those who "covered" the book. And besides that, they will have the plus values of a greater understanding in depth of the particular topics which they have looked at in a real historical fashion.

Well, this plays upon your question, Dr. Dunbar. Somewhere, either in the lecture, probably, or outside reading, the kind of depth study that makes history come alive and memorable must be developed.

Prof. Maier: I think we gain some of this depth study automatically in the sense that each instructor in history of civilization does have his specialty. In my course, I am sure students learn a bit more about Roman history than they might about the era of the League of Nations, for example.

I think we have arrived, Gentlemen, at quite definite agreement that the course varies drastically, depending upon the institution involved. Certainly Prof. Cochrane's experience at the University of Chicago is entirely different, I venture to say, from that of Dr. Van Bolt at junior or community colleges. Perhaps you might like to comment, Dr. Van Bolt, on the special problems of this course at junior colleges.

Dr. Roger Van Bolt: We have been talking about underdeveloped areas here, and I feel as though I come from one of the underdeveloped areas of education. As a matter of fact, there were times yesterday when I was wondering if I wasn't in a pocket of poverty. (Laughter)

Junior colleges, as such, have several characteristics. For one, they have been opportunistic institutions in some cases. With the coming vast extension of education, junior colleges will play an increasing role in this matter of mass education. We are dealing in junior colleges primarily with Mr. Average Citizen that we have been talking about.

In the future, I think, these colleges will be called upon to carry an increasing share of undergraduate education. In this state with eighteen junior colleges, there is a growing number of university students who are junior college transfers, which may not have been true ten or fifteen years ago. The point is that some undergraduate education will take place at junior colleges, from which students will transfer into the liberal arts program at senior institutions. I think it will be important that we of the junior colleges prepare for this transfer by fitting our goals into those of the university. Now, this is difficult, since our students are transferring to several institutions, and we must attempt to fit into the pattern of several institutions concurrently.

At the same time, junior colleges -- and they are changing very rapidly -- will take a number of students that you will no longer see; for example, those in technical and engineering education. Some of you cited students for whom this would be the last course in history at the collegiate level. Some of these students will no longer be in the four-year program; they will be in technical education, as mass education begins to close a few doors in higher education.

In some junior colleges, history of civilization has been a "leader course," as we call it, in which students with varying abilities are put through the paces, and if they can survive Western civilization then they go on, otherwise out. Whether this is right or wrong, it is being done.

We are very much concerned about the kind of instructors in civilization that are produced, because we are depending upon, of course, the instructor that is turned out by your graduate schools for our survey courses. I think that graduate study for junior college instructors will be increased. I don't think that you can go down to the high schools and pick them out, which is one of the pat answers to staffing in junior colleges. The kind of instructor that we need will be the kind that Prof. Dunbar has talked about again and again, one who has studied on a graduate level.

The fact that freshmen do not possess the necessary academic skills when they come to us has been mentioned repeatedly in our discussions. Now, while I would welcome having a four-year institution look more closely at the things we are doing at the junior colleges, I think we should perhaps borrow a page from some of the other disciplines. As historians, instead of belaboring the point that these students are coming to us with a poor background, might we not do what some of our colleagues in the physical sciences have done: to go down into the high schools and provide the kind of materials, the kind of program that we want taught in order to provide us this good course we all want in our institutions? I was referring particularly to what is happening in the field of physics, for example, or the field of biology. The universities have gone down and structured the kind of foundation course they need upon which to build. I think that the concern of the American Historical Association over the preparation of secondary teachers has been admirable. This is a step in the right direction.

But our providing the kind of civilization course you want is important, because in each of your institutions I think you will see many, many more junior college students than you have in the past. So to provide this kind of course, we must tie one hand with the transfer program, and the other to a program that is virtually untouched, namely, the increasingly complex technical areas which are moving quickly toward a general education program.

Prof. Dunbar: It seems to me that we should go back to what Dr. Perkins said at the very start. We have this course in Western or world civilization with us. It is being taught, as we all know, very blindly. Now, carrying out the sort of thing that Prof. Snell proposes, whether it is good or bad, depends on a revolution in the general education program in colleges and universities. I think we would benefit from hearing from people like Dean Schaefer, or Dr. Sullivan, or Prof. Thomas on whether in their opinion such a revolution is pending in general education. Is there a ferment at work which is likely to result in major modification? If this is not so, then we are talking about something that is purely academic. If it is so, then we can make a contribution by proposing what we think should take the place of the history of civilization course.

Prof. Bruun: In the light of what Dr. Dunbar has said, it seems that one of the most significant points that has been made is the possibility of improving the quality of the civilization course by improving the quality of the teaching, particularly the training of the assistants. If the consensus of opinion is that the course is going to remain active, perhaps another ten years, then I would agree that anything that can help toward a program of better training for the assistants will be of the utmost importance. It seems to me no radical change is in prospect for the course. There is no proposal for abandoning the textbooks. Presumably the textbooks will remain one of the implements, but the need is to make the course more accurate, more vigorous, to get to the student more of the enthusiasm and training he needs from it. That has been emphasized and I would agree. I would be very much interested to hear further suggestions on how this better teacher training might be made effective.

Prof. Dale Pattison: Prof. Snell said that a successful university professor in history has done certain things: first, he has developed a concept of time; secondly, a concept of process or change; and thirdly, he has raised certain questions. My question is: wouldn't a course in comparative civilizations or world cultures -- the broader the better -- raise more questions, give a better concept of time, and perhaps a more satisfactory view of process and change than a course that you suggest, for instance, a medieval survey?

Prof. Strayer: May I interject one thing here (and I am glad Dean Schaefer is here to correct me if I am wrong): I think the best you can hope for in reading speed is something like 30 pages an hour. Would that be considered normal?

Dean Schaefer: Not at Princeton, but I guess that is a fair estimate for colleges across the country.

Prof. Strayer: The only reason I raise this is that in all of our discussion I think we have overlooked the fact that there is a limited amount of reading which the student can be expected to do, especially at the freshman level, especially when he is taking at least three other courses in every institution I know and at most of them he is taking four other courses. That is why you have textbooks, and I don't like any textbook, including my own. But the textbook is there because the student can't do very much other reading unless you cut your course down to something like the limits Prof. Cochrane has suggested. Well, this in turn is what makes the lecture and the discussion so absolutely necessary, because the student isn't doing enough reading. He does need to have someone to guide him and show him the significance of these very brief sections of the story that he gets. The fact that you are going to cover one period rather than another, or one length of time rather than another, doesn't seem to me as very relevant when it comes to this question of the quality of the instruction. This is the absolutely essential thing; there is no way of getting around it. You cannot turn freshmen loose on courses without some interpretation. So I think the real problem is the problem of instruction and much less the problem of what is in the course.

Prof. Thomas: I would like to answer the question which was put to me by Prof. Dunbar about a possible revolution in general education programs. There are certainly some important changes in progress at present. I doubt that they are having much effect on the role of history in general education except to broaden the scope of history by giving more attention to non-Western history, though at the cost of further reduction of emphasis on Western civilization. I refer only to the required courses in history which are generally included as a part of general education requirements. I might add that there are many colleges which make no general requirement in history, but include history as optional among other social science or humanities courses. Nevertheless, I think that a poll of college teachers would likely show that "a knowledge of our cultural heritage" would be surpassed only by "English" as the subject matter most indispensable in a general education. History or historically-oriented courses are the principal instruments for giving this knowledge of our cultural heritage. I don't think this is likely to change.

However, I do not think a general education can be defined in terms of any particular kind of course. There are many kinds of courses in any area which can serve the ends of a general education. Histories of Western or world civilization are among these, and there are different ways of organizing these courses. Such courses, however, are primarily concerned with facts and interpretations of facts about some part of the past, and we have already discussed the difficulties which the limitations of time impose upon the effective teaching of these courses. There is another approach to the study of history which is, I think, also very important in a general education. If well taught, it can help students to continue to study the past when they are no longer in our hands. We came close to touching on this approach yesterday when Prof. Kelly spoke of the distinction between history as a subject matter and history as a discipline. History taught as a subject matter consists of facts about some period of the past and the interpretations historians offer in explanation of the relationship between those facts. Students are rarely given as a part of their general education any understanding of the art of history, that is, the ways in which the historian makes his interpretations. They do not learn to distinguish between kinds of historical constructions nor to recognize assumptions about human and natural forces which determine the historian's theses. Personally, I believe this is a kind of knowledge about history (i.e., history as an art or discipline) which in the long run is as useful as the study of history as a body of knowledge about some segment of the past.

History as a discipline enters into almost every area of the students' experience. As I said yesterday, I am not professionally a historian (in the conventional sense of the word). But I could not have been trained as a teacher of English literature without an adequate training in historical disciplines. I must use them all the time. Students need some of this skill in order to perceive what we as instructors are doing in interpreting the past, whether it be political history or literary history. They need this skill because it provides the means for examining critically the daily confrontation of historical judgments (often passed off as facts) which they encounter in newspapers and all other means of mass communication every day.

I would like to suggest that this group might learn much by finding out the different kinds of history which students are receiving as a part of their general education -- in the institutions represented here and in other institutions. I should like to know to what extent institutions provide for different kinds of courses and methods of instruction adapted to the differences in preparation our students bring to college and also adapted to differences in their aptitude.

Prof. Snell: I don't want to seem to avoid questions that have been put to me, and I would like to reply to Prof. Pattison. I thought I made it very clear yesterday that I feel that the history of civilization course can and does do quite a good job of getting across the concept of time, process, and change to students. It may do this better than one of the medium-breadth courses that I suggested I would prefer. But what the history of civilization course cannot do, in my opinion, is to make the student aware of the way in which historians work, the problems that a historian confronts, the problems that he as a student and he as a layman for the rest of his life should be aware of. Certainly I do not mean to imply any criticism of the textbooks, unlike Prof. Strayer who might have been overly modest. I think we have some remarkably good textbooks for the course, probably as good as we can devise if we are going to give this kind of course. But it is the instructional problem and the student problem that strike me as the stumbling blocks in the way of making this the kind of college-level instruction that I think we need, and the kind that I think freshman students are ready to get after twelve years of elementary and secondary school -- even "C" students. They feel starved because they have been fed superficiality for years. They have not been expected to dig their teeth into anything. And if we, on top of that, provide a civilization course, I think we are giving them more of that, despite our very best efforts. I point to the instructional problem, the fact that I am a little bit fatalistic about our inability to train a man to teach this kind of course because of its breadth. And I point to the student problem; I think the student is incapable of getting anything more than a surface exposure to anything this broad in one year's time. I reached a conclusion that it is best that we scrap it and give him something that is more manageable, yet not a highly specialized course. Give him a course in medieval history and you give him a thousand years of history. There is a good bit of breadth in that. A course in Latin-American history, properly taught, draws tremendously from medieval and early modern European background. It can't be taught with any sense at all unless the student is made to see the connection with United States history in the 19th and 20th centuries, and modern European history in the 19th and 20th centuries. It has breadth; it has complexity. It has cultural values as well as political. So does Far Eastern history: this is a broad course. We are not talking about a highly specialized course when I mention these options that I would give to the freshman student.

Prof. Taylor: In the light of the chat I had yesterday afternoon with Prof. Pattison about instructional problems in this course with television as medium, I would be most interested to get your reactions to this kind of problem, because I can see that TV may be getting more and more into this whole problem of communication: whether or not you can get a two-way communication by TV, and so on.

Prof. Maier: Good! We do want to delve into this question of television. However, this logically would have to follow an answer to the question of whether or not history of civilization as a course should be maintained or scrapped.

Prof. Snell: Let me make a suggestion, if I may, Prof. Maier. I assume that you are going ahead with the study project....

Prof. Maier: No, not necessarily at all; this is a matter for the conference to decide. -- Just let me tie up another thread. One of the frustrating things about an animated conference like this is the fact that a train of thought can be developed but cannot be completed, since another one has come along. Several important progressions of thought need further discussion, which is not possible now. However, I want to point out that these trains of thought are not wasted effort: they will be in the transcript, so you will all have a chance to react a month or so later.

Now, could the conference go on record at this point, perhaps by a vote, as to whether or not the basic history of civilization course -- Western or world, traditional or revised -- should be maintained, or should Prof. Snell's suggested segmentation approach be adopted? What is your pleasure?

Prof. Snell: I think a more pertinent question to propose to the group is: is a study needed? I would say that it would be inappropriate for this group to say either that the civilization course should be retained or that the civilization course should be dropped. Make that the first question of your study, possibly. If the answer is "yes, it should be retained," then questions relating to improvement would follow.

Prof. Wallbank: Mr. Chairman, we are a representative group, of course, and it might be interesting to see what our reactions would be. Otherwise, we would really be delaying our decision. In a sense, of course, several of us are interested parties in this, but on the other hand, long before my own materials were successful, I was trying to fight what I thought was the good fight for a very important course. So I would like to see this group go on record.

Prof. Cochrane: I would be opposed to a vote, because I don't believe the issues are clear enough yet. Furthermore, simply because we as historians really don't want something that may not be within our professional competence is no reason why other departments -- geographers, sociologists, pathologists, and what not -- could not give a general survey course, even if it does not fulfill the particular requirement that Mr. Snell was talking about, of providing a temporal perspective; or of what Mr. Thomas referred to: introducing a student into a particular kind of discipline that is an intrinsic part of general education. This is one thing, and certainly a survey of the contemporary world is quite another. I think that if we go on record at this moment on such a sharply defined question we are missing all kinds of subtleties.

Prof. Perkins: I am bound to approach this problem with what I consider to be an empirical point of view. I wouldn't dare tell a given school whether the course should be retained or not. This to me is a practical question. Does the course create enthusiasm? Does it lead to a greater interest in history? Are there visible signs that it has an impact upon students? I want to know how the course fares in each individual case. And until then, I can't sit in judgment on the course. A vote in principle does not mean much to me.

Prof. Dunbar: I should be inclined to agree with that, Mr. Chairman. Getting back to your original comment, Prof. Perkins, whether it is good or bad, we have this course all over the country. The question which Prof. Snell has raised should be discussed and talked about for an entire session of a conference, but that is one problem. The other problem, the one which really concerned us originally, was, granted that the course remains, how do you improve it and how do you prepare instructors for it? There are two questions.

Prof. Smith: I agree very strongly with Prof. Perkins and several others: I would certainly be unprepared to vote. I don't understand the question. I'm not certain there is a question. I hesitate to be discourteous with respect to the comments of Prof. Snell, but with all due respect, I think many of these questions were discussed twenty to twenty-five years ago. The facts have overtaken the theories that were discussed at that time. We have thousands and thousands of students in so-called global and Western civilization courses throughout the United States. We must take first things first. We must deal with the diamond-hard, proved facts of the world in which we now are. The courses are here.

Prof. Sullivan: It seems to me that any group of historians, such as this, or any one historian, or any department, doesn't really have the right to speak on this question. This is a matter that bears on the whole policy of the university. A history department must first consult with others, I think, on this. So I would be opposed to putting this question so sharply, too.

Prof. Maier: Well, our answer to the question of whether or not the traditional or revised civilization course is appropriate in the college curriculum would reflect only our feelings on this matter. Quite obviously, it would have no binding force whatever on any history department or any university.

Prof. Buss: I think even that is extremely risky. I wouldn't swap my devotion to world civilization for anything, and I would hate to have a questionnaire from you or from any outside source coming to my university and asking, "Is my course worthwhile or should it be scrapped?" I really think that you would be on very dangerous ground. I think it is wonderful to exchange opinions as we are doing here, but I would be careful with questionnaires.

Prof. Thomas: I would say the same thing. I would not want anything I said this morning to be construed as a negative attitude toward the course. I think we ought to be aware of all the problems and limitations of any kind of course which we give, because the only way to improve a course is through a consciousness of its limitations.

Prof. Maier: Unless I hear additional support for calling the question, it will be withdrawn. -- Then we will conclude this segment of the discussion by asking Prof. Taylor if he will tell us what our British brethren are doing in this area -- if they have problems similar to ours or if their experience is entirely different. Prof. Alastair Taylor, who has taught both in Canada and in Scotland, will discuss "History of Civilization Courses Outside the United States."

Prof. Taylor: It may be appropriate to call this "Operation Lipton Tea", because what I am offering now represents a kind of change of pace. In some ways it is rather irrelevant to what we have just been discussing, and it is not going to advance the resolution of our problems; but there may be negative comfort to be derived from the fact that all the problems that we have been discussing in the past two days, in one way or another, have been raised in Britain or in Canada.

Having been given an assignment whose terms of reference I can describe only by pre-empting one of Arnold Toynbee's favorite adjectives, namely "ecumenical," and being limited to fifteen or twenty minutes, I have to be, of course, selective and also superficial. I'll speak briefly about some of the developments in the United Kingdom and then look at the present situation in Canada.

In the 1951 edition of the Oxford University Handbook, we find: "For over a quarter of a century the Honour School of Modern History has attracted the largest number of candidates of any of the arts courses at Oxford." Now that sounds encouraging as a starter, but I should point out that at Oxford the word "Modern" stands in contradistinction to "Ancient" since "it includes what are known as the Dark Ages and the Middle Ages." The history of England from Caesar's landing to the outbreak of World War I is prescribed and examined in three papers. Since "the Oxford School of History has as its backbone the study of the Law of the Constitution [and I don't mean the American Constitution] from the earliest times," because originally Law and History were a combined school until 1872, "all candidates must write a paper on some element of constitutional history." Then they have to write two papers on what is called "General History" and this "means European history and in later times world history. The earliest period", *this is in modern history*, "is from A.D. 285 to 604. The latest", and I am still speaking from the 1951 handbook, "is from 1815 to 1914." I remember being told that if I wanted to go beyond that, best reference was the back file of the Times. (Laughter) However, in the Examination Statutes as revised to 1960, General History is now subdivided into 14 periods, with the last covering the years 1871 to 1939.

Now, in addition, candidates seeking either a First Class or Second Class Honours degree, must offer a special subject based on documents studied in detail. "The earliest of these subjects is St. Augustine of Hippo; the most modern are 'Slavery and Secession in the United States' and 'British Policy and the Making of the Ententes, 1898 to 1907'."

To see how this approach operates in practice, I made a simple count of a Lectures Series list picked at random, in this case the Trinity Term for 1959. In British History I counted twenty-five lecture series. Of these, six were in the Middle Ages; two in the 16th century; two in the 17th; four in the 18th; and six in the 19th. In some cases the lecture series ended in 1906 or 1914. But only one fell exclusively in the 20th century, "The Evolution of the Commonwealth, 1919 to 1959".

Turning to the field of "General History," I found twenty-nine lecture series offered. Apart from courses covering ideational and institutional subjects of an ecclesiastical and military nature, and so on, various countries or regions were singled out. Italy led with three; Germany, two; Spain, two; France, one; Russia and the Near East, two; and the United States, two, including Arthur Link's series on President Roosevelt, the New Deal, and American Democracy.

However, it is also necessary to include offerings in related Schools, such as PPE, that is, Philosophy, Politics and Economics, as well as "Greats" -- Litterae Humaniores -- before attempting to assess, however superficially, historical instruction at Oxford. Thus the same lecture list set forth twenty-five series offerings on Greek and Roman history. And it is to PPE that one must turn to find most of the offerings relating to the 20th century. These included, for example, British Political History, 1916-1938, Arabic Political and Social Thought, Administrative and Social Questions in British Tropical Africa, and Race Relations in Selected Territories. There were also separate seminars on Soviet Affairs, Far Eastern Studies, and South Asian Studies. In October 1960, a new subject was introduced into Politics, "International Relations since 1939." I took it before that date, and we never got past the League of Nations.

Nor have I mentioned the listing of the Faculty of Oriental Studies which offers a large number of lectures on Ugaritic texts, Arabic and the Koran, Turkish, Persian, Sanskrit, Akkadian, Egyptian, Chinese and Japanese, all of which presuppose some specialized knowledge of the history of the civilizations involved.

To summarize this overview of Oxford's offering:

ONE: the faculty of Modern History is, by North American standards, not quite modern in that it is heavily weighted in favor of traditional subject matter, primarily British history prior to the 20th century, and Western European ideational and institutional subjects.

TWO: one must turn to other faculties to find non-European, and almost all offerings relating to 20th-century subjects.

THREE: the overall picture, I found in despair, is one of general imbalance and even of some startling omissions. The United States and the Soviet Union are inadequately represented in the lecture series, as to a lesser proportional degree are the Middle East and South Asia. Equatorial Africa receives the greatest attention, but this focus seems to be due to problems connected with the withdrawal of British imperial interests in Equatorial Africa. Thus we find nothing offered on Islamic Africa per se, or on Bantu cultures, etc. Startling to a Canadian like myself is the absence of any offerings on the so-called "white" dominions, far less on the historical interrelations of countries comprising, say, the North Atlantic community. Again, Oxford has no interest in Latin America, or in Iberian civilization and colonization. And though the Faculty of Oriental Studies offers lectures on the Chinese Novel and on Japanese texts, as well as on "Advanced Chinese Religions", whatever that may be, Oxford in Trinity Term 1959 offered no specific lectures on the history of either China or Japan.

Now, it is fashionable for Oxonians to regard their alma mater as the last refuge of lost causes, though I can faintly discern in the time intervening, since I was up, some attempts to drag the institution kicking and screaming (in muted tones, of course) into the 20th century. But I need hardly point out what you will have already noted for yourselves: Oxford offers nothing approaching the history of civilization, either Western or world, and it just doesn't intend to.

Now, when one goes north of the Tweed, which is a very sensible direction in which to move (laughter), he encounters a roughly comparable situation in the Scottish universities. At Edinburgh, for example, whether the undergraduate is reading for "Ordinary" or for the Honours History degree, the only courses which attempt to cover a broad chronological spectrum are British History and European History. There are any number of specialized fields, such as Scottish History, Ecclesiastical History -- which is just another way of saying the biography of John Knox (laughter) -- Ancient History, and an interesting group here, Imperial and American History (laughter), and Islamic History, as well as Prehistoric Archaeology and Classical Archaeology. When teaching at Edinburgh as Visiting Professor in 1959 and 1960, I had the audacity, I suppose, to introduce a course which probably came closest to a survey of civilization, but I taught it in the Department of Geography. Within the sphere of historical geography, I developed a course which traced the interplay of temporal and spatial factors in the structuring of fluvial, thalassic, and oceanic societies from 5000 B.C. right up to the Industrial Revolution. It caused considerable interest and controversy among the disputatious Scots, at both the faculty and undergraduate levels -- but here again, we find another parallel with the situation at Oxford; namely, innovation and a broadening both of historical subject matter and pedagogical treatment seem to be taking place in British universities, and I would surmise that we can expect to see this process accelerated in the new provincial universities such as Sussex, that are coming into being at the present time. But, in Oxford and Cambridge, at least, these innovations are taking place in departments other than history.

I have dealt at some length with the two British universities I know best, and in particular with Oxford, because it exerts a special influence upon the structuring of curricula in British schools. The public schools and grammar schools take their cue from "Oxbridge," and, of course, instruction in the sixth form is geared to preparation for passing Oxford's and Cambridge's entrance examinations -- Responsions at Oxford. Thus, at Oxford, the only history subject provided for in Responsions is English history.

But pressures are building up in favor of broadening the subject matter in British secondary schools. In 1959, I attended an educational conference sponsored by the Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons, which was concerning itself with curriculum problems. This was attended also by headmasters from public schools and principals from the big new comprehensive high schools that are being developed in London. There was a general consensus that the teaching of history must be overhauled, that there was need to get away from nineteenth-century stereotypes -- this was a point, incidentally, that was not articulated by the headmasters from Winchester, but was very strongly emphasized by the principals and the history masters in the comprehensive schools in London. Every attempt must be made to get away from the stereotypes of the "Empire" and traditional concentration upon British particularism, and to focus greater attention upon international history, including a fresh approach to non-Western experience, so that Asian and African cultures would be taught in terms of indigenous values and interests rather than as appendages of a now-departed

British imperium. A majority of the educationists present also called for greater attention to the teaching of international relations on the secondary level and, in particular, to the activities of international organizations and regional, supra-national groupings, such as the Common Market, NATO, and so on. It was my understanding, based upon talks with officials at that Inter-Parliamentary conference, that the leadership of the Labor Party intended to initiate moves in these directions once they were called upon to form a Government, which is likely to happen, apparently, this year. Harold Wilson and his colleagues have gone on record for updating British education, so as to provide more comprehensive training in twentieth-century science and technology.

Well, turning to Canada -- as in the United States, education in Canada is not under federal jurisdiction. The British North America Act states that "In and for each Province the Legislature may exclusively make Laws in relation to Education." Certain Provinces are seeking greater and greater autonomy. The educational process is something that is jealously safeguarded.

Nevertheless, at the university level a broad area of agreement exists among the Canadian university curriculum makers. For our purposes here, I looked briefly at the relevant data on the calendars of the twenty-eight leading Canadian universities and colleges; this runs the gamut from east to west and includes all ten Provinces. An examination of these calendars revealed the following facts:

ONE: All of the Canadian institutions examined do offer a survey course on civilization in the first or second year.

TWO: On the basis of the information supplied, 13 courses are offered three times a week in lecture form; three institutions offer their survey course twice a week; one college, that is Bishop's, has structured the survey course on the basis of two weekly lectures and one seminar; while the University of Toronto provides for two lectures per week plus one tutorial.

THREE: In the larger institutions, these survey courses are generally listed as being offered by "Members of the Department". In smaller colleges there is a designation of a particular instructor, for the most part. I don't know what to make of that, but this is the reality.

FOUR: A wide variety of textbooks and historical atlases is assigned. At the University of Toronto, on the other hand, no single textbook is prescribed, but that goes for any course in history. Instead, "a full reading list for each course, general, pass and honors, will be supplied at the opening of term", says the calendar of that institution.

FIVE: Almost all of the institutions offer survey courses in Western rather than world civilization. The largest single group offers a course running from about the decline of the Roman Empire to the present; or in the case of both the University of Toronto and the newly established York University, in the Toronto Metropolitan area, to 1945. A variant in this survey is the "Development of Christian Civilization from the Time of Christ to the Present", offered at the University of Windsor, which was formerly offered at Assumption and is now offered at Windsor. A lesser number of institutions offer survey courses in Western civilization from around 1500 to the present. Three institutions, British Columbia, Carleton at Ottawa, and Waterloo, emphasize an ideational approach, such as Waterloo's "Historical Introduction to the Ideas of Western Civilization", or Carleton's "Main Directions in Modern History."

SIX: The three institutions offering a survey course based on the global approach are Memorial at St. Johns in Newfoundland, St. Francis Xavier at Antigonish, and Sir George Williams at Montreal. These concentrate, in large measure, on the history of early civilization, going from paleolithic times to 1650.

We might add to the foregoing this personal assessment: while the survey courses reflect an acceptance of the United States experience -- at least up till fifteen minutes ago -- in curriculum structuring and hence make use of the appropriate American texts as well (not that they always say they are appropriate but there is no Canadian substitute), the history departments in Canadian colleges have traditionally been staffed either by British-born or British-trained instructors, or by Canadians who have done their own graduate work primarily in European, British, or Canadian studies. Now this judgment of mine would appear to be substantiated by the preference for survey courses whose terminal dates approximate the time span of the Modern History schools at Oxford and other United Kingdom universities.

As a corollary to the foregoing, it might be pointed out that a frequent comment in Canadian history departments is this: "Trying to cover all of Western civilization in one course is too much; to make the course World civilization could be insane." I don't know why I am saying this, but I am trying to be objective. (Laughter) To cover the resulting deficiencies in departmental programs, most of the larger institutions hire an Asian or African expert to offer a course or two at the third- or fourth-year honors level.

I have been told by contacts among Canadian textbook publishers that many history departments consider the first-year course as a drudge to teach: "the students aren't interested," so that little thought is given to improving the course, or of assigning the job to the more able and experienced members of the staff. I would suspect that the indictment is not necessarily universally valid, but still, there it is.

But changes appear to be in the offing:

ONE: An increasing number of faculty staff are being recruited, not only from among Canadians with United States degrees, but from among Asian and other non-Western scholars -- Pakistan, India, West Indies -- who in turn are interested in presenting survey courses with a global rather than a traditionally European point of view.

TWO: Related disciplines on Canadian campuses, such as geography, political science, and economics, are progressively offering more courses in their fields of specialization in non-Western areas. Geography, for example, at Queens has been adding to its listings in terms of Asian and African areas.

THREE: Prior to World War II, Canadian universities were primarily undergraduate schools, but the postwar period has seen a remarkable proliferation of graduate studies. In the humanities and behavioral disciplines this has called for a rapid enlargement not only of library resources, but of specialized studies in non-European and international fields. The problem therefore arises that when you go into graduate studies involving non-Western and international areas of concentration, like International Organization or International Relations on the graduate level, then you have got to find more adequate preparation at the undergraduate level in turn, than we have had heretofore in Canada. This year, the Canadian Universities Foundation published a detailed report of a recent survey of such studies in Canadian colleges. It just came out six weeks ago. It pointed out that past practice has been based on the idea that the context of undergraduate study in Canada "should be our own way of life and its basis in the Graeco-Roman, Western European tradition....a majority of scholars today reject this doctrine as both invalid per se and inadequate for today's world. It is possible to study one's own /this is underscored in the report which I did not write/ culture and a foreign culture at the same time." (Page 65) The report makes a number of recommendations: the strengthening of existing facilities in international relations, Russian and East European studies, Asian and Islamic studies, African, and Latin American studies. Not only must new and specialized studies within these fields be developed; there must also be incorporated "the study of the world within the humanities and social sciences, so much so that there will no longer be any temptation in Canada to see these five fields of study as exotica."

The report concludes: "In the interwar years North America luxuriated in an isolationist attitude of mind, Canada even more than the United States. Since 1945 a profound change in attitude has occurred in the United States, but in Canada today a pervasive indifference is found in nearly every sector of society, including government, business and the universities; a lack of recognition that Canada requires a corps of specialists on different areas of the world, and an unwillingness to admit that Canada needs men and women who know the languages of other peoples, their history, their ways of life, their culture patterns, their aspirations; and an unawareness that it is pursuing research on the relations of states, at the international level.

"Yet, there is cause for some optimism. This indifference is being pricked by more and more individuals throughout Canadian society. The time is propitious. The universities face the challenge of assuming the lead in replacing indifference with an informed awareness and expertise. These are the primary reasons for provision for these studies, not, as is sometimes suggested, that such studies are necessary to ensure international amity; nor can one postulate that greater international cooperation will inevitably follow. Let us proceed to build up these fields," the report ends. We may only dare to hope that one result may be better understanding.

Prof. Robert J. Hahn: Prof. Taylor, in the secondary schools of England are any courses given which are comparable to our world civilization or our Western civilization courses?

Prof. Taylor: Well, they haven't been, simply because of the grammar and public schools which are curriculum leaders. They have understandably geared their offerings in history to preparing the students to pass their responsions. But this has not satisfied the new comprehensive school curriculum makers, and they are therefore searching for new approaches. The Minister of Education has been very concerned with this whole matter. They realize that a break with tradition has been forced upon them. -- In Canada, similarly, much soul-searching is going on at the present time in the Province of Ontario. Two Provinces, British Columbia and Ontario, run through grade thirteen. (This is a monstrous year, at the present time, because it is just a matter of rote learning for one year and then a regurgitation.) But skipping grade thirteen, what you have in Ontario, and this is comparable I think in other Provinces, is history taught for those going into the college stream. They get history in the following way in Ontario, our largest Province and the pace-setter in matters educational: In grade eleven, world history is taught in two parts: ancient history, and they start with pre-literate man and take up the four river valleys; then they go to Greece -- the Aegean, the Golden Age of Hellas; Rome -- the spread of Roman power in the Mediterranean World, the decline of Roman morale in public and private life, etc; the last years of the Republic, and then the Roman Empire. Then the second part is given over to medieval history: causes of internal decay of the Roman Empire, transition to the medieval world, its disintegration, and so on.

Prof. Wallbank: How far does that go on?

Prof. Taylor: This will take you up to 1500, because in the second year, grade twelve, you have world history -- as they call it -- part two. The first section takes you from 1500 to 1763; the second, from 1763 to 1850; the third, from 1850 to 1919; and the last, from 1919 to the present. Now when you actually look at a breakdown here, you find that world history is in large measure really a misnomer. It is more appropriate in regard to grade eleven because of the interest in non-Western societies; otherwise it is really Western civilization in grade twelve. But that's the way that they attempt to cover this survey in Ontario at the high-school level in two successive years.

We might also look at the Province of Saskatchewan, which until a month or so ago, had a left-wing Provincial government for something like a decade, and which has been extremely interesting in its social and economic planning. It is interesting that the Department of Education at the university in Saskatchewan has been the most insistent of any of these Provincial Departments in emphasizing that the non-Western and the technological side must be covered. This has been a forward-thrusting area; whether this is retrograde or not, I don't know, but it appears to have developed as a concomitant of the thinking that has been given to social and economic planning. In Saskatchewan it has been argued that there must be a broadening of Canadian intellectual horizons. The Ontario approach is considered by Saskatchewan to be far too conservative, in turn.

Now, I attended a caucus of high-school teachers last year in Alberta. I was making a special plea for updating the social studies program, but I was also adding the need to try to get more of a concept of geographical or environmental factors as well as technological factors at work in society. I had a very interested response to the point where I was asked to give a keynote address to the newly formed Canadian Association for the Social Studies which met in Montreal. And here again the consensus is for more non-Western history, and for more technology and science. Those who attended declared, "this is what we need in Quebec." These are some of the movements that seem to be taking place in Canada. The pedagogical problems seem to be pretty well comparable.

Prof. Maier: Is anyone familiar with any civilization-type courses as offered in the non-English-speaking areas of the world?

Prof. Cochrane: I can tell you a little of what happens in Italy. I certainly wouldn't compare it with anything that happens either in Canada or in the United States, because generally the education in history is probably inferior. Nevertheless, Italians have a lycée, a thing which gives most of the students a great collection of facts from the founding of Rome to the present, in which Italian history is included. This information is retained in the utmost detail by the students until they get to their "bachot". The morning after they finish their baccalaureate examination they have forgotten everything. For most students in the faculty of letters, some sort of course in history is required. Depending upon the faculty, it usually will be either a general course in European history or a course in ancient history. One of these is required in almost every program. These courses provide students with a reading list of about fifteen books on various aspects of the history of Western Europe -- this is almost entirely European. Then the teacher gives a very monographic course on something that he happens to be interested in at the time, which becomes the center of instruction. The professor provides no help in the reading of the books. The students are supposed to be mature and able to do that. But within his own field he goes into enormous detail on one particular subject. As an example, I attended a course of Prof. Chabod at the University of Rome, some years ago. The course was a history of Europe, and he taught exclusively about the changes in the administrative structure of the Duchy of Milan between 1500 and 1600. Consequently, the students get a thorough appreciation of the way in which a historian deals with the questions of historical investigation -- the kinds of material he works with, the questions he asks of it, and the kinds of conclusions he draws from the materials that he studies.

Prof. Buss: I can say a few words about what is happening in Japan. Until the end of the occupation, the Japanese tradition was strictly British, as Alastair has explained it. I should say that there are many Japanese scholars who are sitting around tables and discussing precisely the same questions which we are discussing here. It will take some time before their decisions will be entered into their various curricula, but at least a ferment is at work. Each university will come to its own decision.

Prof. Maier: Are there any other overseas traditions which might be represented at this point? -- Since no area of potential improvement in history of civilization courses is more important than that which concerns the teacher, the instruction, the pedagogical aspect, we thought it very important to invite an educational methodologist to this conference, who would also add to its interdepartmental flavor. So we are very pleased to present Dr. Robert Schaefer, Dean of the Teachers College at Columbia University, who will address himself to the question, "Is special preparation for instructors in history of civilization desirable?"

Dean Schaefer: I'd first like to lodge a strong protest for having been asked to follow Prof. Taylor. I can't possibly match his charm and wit. (Laughter) I'm afraid that I must also acknowledge that I am a rather incompetent student because I misunderstood the question. As a dean of a graduate professional school in education, I assumed that the question was addressed simply to the matter of pedagogy, as a special element in the training of teachers. But I think the discussion here indicates that the question is really broader than pedagogy.

Personally, I would advise no special substantive preparation for teachers of the history of civilization. I don't think that one should try to train a generalist capable of meeting all of the subject-matter demands of such a course. I would agree with Dr. Perkins that there is inherent conflict between specialization and graduate preparation of teachers. I would certainly like to reiterate what Dr. Thomas has said, that in the preparation of the teacher, if he is to understand the discipline in which he works, he needs to probe it in depth as a discipline. If someone were to choose to provide him instead with subject matter or content covering the entire scope of Western civilization, this would seem to me to deprive him of a very necessary part of his training.

I think also if you try to train a person specifically for this course, you will limit him substantially from a sociological point of view. He would have no place to go, other than to a course in Western civilization. He would be limited to the kind of institution where he may find employment. The institutions which we know demand specialization, scholarship, and research in a specialized area. I think we would grossly limit his career possibilities by trying to train him as a generalist spanning the entire field of Western civilization.

I can certainly speak with a great deal of conviction in this regard on the basis of experience in the field of education. We have had what might be called the position-oriented curriculum for many years. What we have tried to do in education, with great tragedy, is to look at the specific job requirements in a particular area. We say, for example, that the job of dealing with youngsters in the lower schools may demand cursory knowledge of many subject fields; some knowledge of the sociology of the school as an institution; some knowledge of the psychology of development, the psychology of learning; some knowledge of the history of American education; some knowledge of questions of pedagogy, etc. We try to train generalists with a little knowledge to meet all of the various demands of the job. And I think what we have ended up with, in many, many cases, are persons who know a little bit about a lot of things but who know nothing in any depth. If you were to ask me what I think is the most severe failing in education, with a capital "E", I would say it is our past efforts to follow a position-centered curriculum in our graduate studies, rather than trying to provide leverage through command of a particular area of specialization. Knowledge in depth gives an understanding of how new evidence is developed, how new knowledge is gained. So, in the terms of one part of this question, special substantive preparation for instructors, I would answer "no" for the reasons specified.

I gather, much to my surprise and pleasure, that there is a good deal of consensus among the group here that certain kinds of pedagogical preparation ought to be provided to the prospective teacher of history of civilization. I would certainly share that view, and I would have reason to add that I don't think such preparation ought to be left to educationists. I don't think you have any intention of leaving it to educationists (laughter), for it is quite clear that we have enough problems of our own, and we are not prepared to solve the problems that you face. I think there is already a good deal of consensus about the nature of the pedagogical experience which would be desirable. I can only add one or two things. I think, firstly, I would try to provide the prospective teacher with a very healthy respect for the difficulties involved in higher education at all levels, particularly the difficulties in making any difference with students through what the teacher does in the college classroom. I would have him turn, for example, to the evidences coming from social psychology and particularly from sociology. Those specialists who have been looking at the sub-culture of higher education, and seeking empirical evidence as to what happens to students in colleges, have gathered very discouraging data. For the great mass of students it makes little difference what we try to teach them. The evidence so far indicates we have not been able to make an impact upon students in college at all comparable to our aims.

I would ask them to look, for example, at Nevitt Sanford's compilation called The American College, in which he brings to bear several empirical studies on the impact of college upon the individual student. I would hope to develop this kind of healthy respect for the difficulties involved, not in order to frighten the prospective instructor, but to give him time to pause and think seriously of the real complexities and demands of the job which he faces.

I think it would also be well, from my perspective at least, to have the new instructor in civilization develop some broader comprehension of other disciplines which bear upon general education, partially to free him from the compulsion that he has to provide the totality of insights that are hoped for in general education through the course in history of civilization.

As for pedagogical training itself, I would certainly urge that it be carried on not in an academic setting and not in courses about teaching. Rather, discussion and analysis of teaching should proceed as the individual is engaged in the actual process of instruction. No time whatsoever need be wasted on the study of some of the gross problems of teaching, the differences, let's say, between lecture and discussion methods. There is a good deal of evidence already gathered that when you compare the learning of students who attend classes which have a lecturer or a discussion chairman or any other type of teaching leader, it doesn't really make any difference. As a matter of fact, in many experiments it doesn't make any difference if you have no teacher. They still learn about as much. (Laughter) In at least a dozen experiments which I know of, the students were simply requested to follow the reading assignments within the text, read regularly, discuss the matter, and then were promised that they would have no final examination. So they proceeded to meet and then later, as a kind of after thought, they were asked to take the same examination required of students who were in other sections. And they were assured that the grades that they would receive would be assigned by themselves, not by the results of the examination. So the examination was not a threat; it was simply an evaluation. The purpose of it was to gain additional information about the "control" group students who had no teachers. And in several cases what happened was that the students without teachers did precisely as well as other students. You can argue, of course, that the exams were inadequate or asked the wrong questions; but my only point here is that this kind of analysis of gross teaching differences doesn't seem to have much payoff -- it doesn't lead anywhere.

One other thing I think I would comment about is direction in the teaching experience. Several of you around this table have mentioned the necessity of having rather precise objectives and goals in mind when one teaches history. Prof. Perkins mentioned several, for example, and these were echoed by others. It has been my experience as a dean and looking at teachers of history, that if the teacher has a goal in a particular class or series of classes, it is often very difficult to discern. It seems to me that quite frequently he has little or no idea of where he is going or why he is going there -- that objectives or purposes are merely verbalized and just kept in mind as he actually goes through the process of teaching. The point I am trying to make here is that in a seminar based around actual teaching experience, this question needs to be made concrete with a continual probing of the young teacher as to where he is going and what he is attempting to achieve. Make this question of objectives a real one rather than a simple verbal exercise.

One final comment I would like to make is simply a sociological suggestion to do what is possible to change the reward system. When you have teachers assigned to such courses as Western or world civilization, you must demonstrate that there are rewards in terms of rank and salary available.

Prof. Maier: A very perceptive presentation. Thank you very much, Dean Schaefer. -- Just to distill this to its ultimate question: how would you view a Ph.D. in Western or world civilization? Would such a degree program be feasible or advisable?

Dean Schaefer: Personally, I don't think so. I think that a person ought to be trained in a particular field of history, and that he use that specialization to provide the leverage necessary to master other topics in the history of civilization.

Prof. Perkins: In regard to special training, I view the problem a little differently. I think the lectures and section meetings are two different parts of the Western civilization course. In most instances there are lectures, and I think the lecturer should be a scholar with an enthusiasm for a course of this kind and also a special field of his own. So I would answer the question negatively as to whether it is possible to train teachers for this particular program. I would expect that the man who taught the course would have a field of his own, but also some enthusiasm for teaching such a course.

With regard to section meetings, you might well go to another institution which incorporates work of this kind in its doctoral program. It is possible to find people who are compelled to teach for a few years in the process of getting their doctorates, and these people can have had some experience in courses of a general kind. I would not look for a man who wasn't an orthodox Ph.D. I am only saying that in a scholar the instinct to dig deeper is very fundamental, although it may be accommodated with an interest in broad general views.

Prof. Kelly: I echo the proposition of the two preceding speakers that you don't run a graduate program in general education, per se, but that the more orthodox approach to training historians is basically the correct one; and that you then seek certain personalities and people with certain kinds of experience out of this kind of background. I would dissent only this far, to point out again something at Wayne that is strictly empirical.

We do have two courses which we require all our graduate students to take. In a sense they are really "bastard" courses, if you will forgive the phrase; we call them seminars. They have a certain pedagogical implication and yet they are not pedagogical courses, in the ordinary school of education sense. They are bibliography courses and yet they have a certain teaching import. One of these is called "Problems of Western Civilization", and the other is "Problems of American Civilization". These are two-semester courses, or in the way they are set up now, two-quarter courses. These are four-quarter hour courses, so they occupy, in terms of a graduate student, a third of his work or two-thirds of a year. We usually put first the course on the problems of civilization, which deals with the ancient, the earlier part of this field. We have had a man with a very broad outlook, but who is trained basically in Greek and Roman history, especially in the Age of Pericles, handle this portion. This man, beginning with the river-valley culture, introduces certain problems of the historical approach to these societies. He may get the help of our orientalist in this. The students deal with a series of books; they deal with a series of intellectual problems; and they report after ten days, let's say, on Egypt, on the one hand, and the Tigris and Euphrates on the other. Eventually, these students will have listened or read reports on twenty or thirty books. They go from this to the same kind of study on the Oriental empires, and thence to Athens, to Rome, and so on. So during the quarter they certainly haven't studied Egyptian or Athenian or Roman history. They may indeed take these courses, per se, later. But they have rushed across the problems and the bibliography which will be useful to them later in world civilization courses -- though I hasten to say nobody has talked about world civilization, as such, in this seminar. Nonetheless, the student has been introduced to something which might be called historical methodology and historiography, i.e., where do I find a book on Egypt and what should I look for in a book about Egypt -- what have Egyptologists been concerned about? What are the leading books on India? What are the major conceptions that students of Indian history have dealt with, and so on. We have found this equally useful in American history, which in a certain sense is a kind of history of civilization course also. Students in both these courses have uniformly reported that this course has been a godsend to them in broadening the base of their bibliography for their work later in more advanced courses. The faculty's general reaction is: "I wish I'd had a course like that."

Prof. Cochrane: May I just add that the University of Chicago now also has, similarly, a field in the interpretations of Western civilization as one of the fields that a Ph.D. candidate can elect.

Prof. Strayer: Again, empirical information. First, a point that may seem very petty but we find that works very well. Dean Schaefer was talking about rewards for the people in the introductory course. We persuaded our dean some years ago, with great reluctance, to give an extra hour of teaching credit to anybody who would teach the freshman course. (Laughter) We find that this cheers up men who are assigned these sections. They also give no full-time member of the department more than two sections.

We also put in a course called "Problems in World History", which is a little different from the two that have been mentioned, but it has something of the same idea, I think, in mind. It is taught by an expert in Russian history, an expert in Latin-American history, and an expert in Japanese history. These three men deal with the problem of modernization, that is, how do these areas change from pre-industrial to an industrial society. This is more limited than either of the two that have been mentioned, but it does expose our graduate students to non-Western cultures and also gives them some basis for using the comparative method in other periods of history as well.

Prof. Maier: You may be interested, Gentlemen, in a questionnaire which our department sent out about a year ago to history department heads across the country, and which elicited a rather high percentage of response. At that time, we were probing the advisability of special training for history of civilization instructors, so our questionnaire began: "The Department of History at Western Michigan University is exploring the desirability of establishing a graduate program beyond the master's degree level to prepare instructors specifically for freshman and sophomore courses in the history of civilization."

First we asked whether the institution offered such a survey course; if so, how many hours credit are assigned, and this kind of thing. To the question, "Do you usually employ instructors for this course who have done their graduate work in history?" the overwhelming answer was "Yes." This, I think, is instructive to Prof. Cochrane's suggestion that perhaps other departments at a university might staff this course. At present, it seems to be the history departments' responsibility.

Then came the question: "Would special preparation for instructors in history of civilization courses be desirable?" Here the reactions varied widely. Let me read a few representative excerpts which may be of interest. First, the positive response....South Georgia College: "Yes. Too many history majors confine their interest to very narrow fields." Arizona State College: "Some of the instructors are quite narrowly trained to handle broad, comprehensive, idea-centered topics." University of Miami: "... instructors have not learned to integrate and synthesize the material. We are in the process of planning such training here." Drake University: "... It often takes a considerable kind of reorientation to prepare inexperienced instructors. We would welcome the opportunity to employ such people and encourage their training." University of Hawaii: "A broader, better balanced training is needed." These were all in favor of a special graduate program. However, we also encountered some spirited opposition.

Prof. Buss: That doesn't say that they will be in favor of a Ph.D. program; it is further instruction.

Prof. Maier: That's right, though some suggested a terminal degree. -- Now, against any such special graduate program....the University of Illinois: "...In our experience we have never found this to be a problem." University of Georgia: "...The difficulty is that an ambitious person will not be content to spend his life teaching Western civilization to the exclusion of advanced work." Tift College: "...No, professional suicide! Teaching of these courses is generally regarded as a kind of purgatory that all new instructors must endure before showing themselves worthy of teaching advanced courses." San Francisco State College: "...Prestige in the college community attaches to the teaching of advanced courses. I suspect that you may be in the process of creating a pariah class in the academic community." Kansas State: "...If your graduates are not also trained in a particular field, would it not be difficult for them to find good job opportunities for advancement?" And finally, perhaps the most eloquent reply of all, from the University of Chicago: "No". (Laughter)

Prof. Wallbank: I think the University of Redlands initiated some kind of a training program in general education for future instructors, and I believe the Ford Foundation was interested in it. -- It depends, of course, on the area involved. In California, because of our junior colleges and normal school, we have a tremendous demand for men who will teach this broad course. Many of them are weaned away by the junior college, because rather than take a position as an assistant and work up in the professorial ranks, they get a very fine salary, and the junior colleges are paying handsome salaries.

I was very happy to hear Prof. Kelly explain his two seminars. While we can't overburden the Ph.D. requirements, I think that courses like that are indispensable, not only for men who are better prepared to teach world history or Western civilization, but I think that knowledge of the non-West, for example, the action and inter-action between various parts of the world, will make them better balanced historians whether they teach American history or whatever they teach. I would like to see such an orientation course on the Afro-Asian World, or at least on part of it, in which you get acquainted with bibliography, with some of the outstanding historians, some of the interesting principles as they develop, some of the problems they have been concerned with. I think it would be very, very valuable.

Prof. Buss: I would like to second that, Mr. Chairman; but in our experience at Stanford, there is a basic training in the history discipline; this they must take. Then they may take the additional fields under the selected areas of work, where they may go into these non-Western fields, and it could be appropriately directed towards the teaching of world civilization. But it is by no means a substitute for the historiography in the basic discipline. It is a part of it, rather than a substitute for it.

Prof. Wallbank: One of the big problems in Los Angeles is the fact that they have added this third semester. It is a year and a half now, and in the third semester they take up the non-Western world. Now, the great majority of our secondary school teachers have not really had any specific courses in, say, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, India, China; and they are trying to develop courses for these teachers, particularly in the summertime when they can take these courses and thus develop some confidence. Dr. Stavrianos' book is being widely used in high schools. It tends, I think, to minimize the European contribution and European influence, and yet it has been widely adopted. This is a trend in the high schools. So I think our four-year institutions not only have a responsibility for preparing university and college professors to do a good job; if we do retain these broad survey courses, we have a responsibility to see to it that our high-school teachers are not so limited. They have a different outlook on world affairs from what they had in the past, because on the high-school level they are demanding a truly world and global approach.

Prof. Sullivan: Prof. Kelly, do you require graduates to take your course at any particular point in their career?

Prof. Kelly: In effect, yes. They take it as a post-master's course in the first place. Now, there is a kind of happenstance involved in this which isn't scientifically justifiable in this sense of the word. We don't give both courses every year, mainly because it is simply too burdensome. It requires a certain amount of devotion on the part of some staff member. To do this he has to sit down and arrange the bibliography of civilization from ancient Egypt to the 13th century in Europe or the period from the Renaissance to the modern world. He is likely to find this adventuresome, but also very irritating in terms of the work he has underway in his own advanced classes. So we give these courses every other year. We don't permit students to take them until they are on the post-master's-degree level. In effect, we say that the student who is going to go into these quiz sections in Western civilization must take one of these courses at least at the same time. He is also sitting in bull sessions with the instructors who are handling the work in the field. That's the way we do it.

Prof. Sullivan: Would you say that it was any advantage to having the student take this course at the same time that he was being introduced to teaching, over taking it before?

Prof. Kelly: Yes. It has been useful to us, at least, to have him take it at the same. It hasn't always worked out that way, I might add, because there are all kinds of mechanical problems in a small department of adjusting students to this and getting staff fitted to it, and what not.

We have found this experience with instructors from other schools: suppose we take the young Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, or Northwestern, or Columbia, or Stanford, and throw him in one of these civilization courses. His first impulse is that he is going down for the third time....and sometimes he does too. (Laughter) We are really scraping along the surface of the problem here which professional historians don't like to deal with. As professional historians we are trained in what might be called the German tradition. We concentrate on a particular specialty; this involves the notetaking, the documents, the scholarly writing, and the whole paraphernalia that I don't need to describe to you. This is the ideal of the profession. Nobody ever stops to think whether or not this has anything to do with the function which the taxpayers actually pay us for, which is really quite different (for those of us that function in taxpaying institutions). What we are being paid for is not this traditional Germanic function but rather a mass educational process. Prof. Snell, I think, is trying, in a sense, to bring these two responsibilities a little more into line with one another.

Now, heaven forgive me if I bow in the direction of the school of education for a moment. This is the ultimate heresy. (Laughter)

Dean Schaefer: That's all right.

Prof. Kelly: I'll bow backward, because I share much of the academic prejudice of the more orthodox disciplines -- you recognize that. But I think we should then turn around and look at ourselves. My experience as a department chairman is that the young historian is trained in this European Germanic technique, which is highly valid for its purposes and aims ultimately at getting an article in the American Historical, or Speculum, or Mississippi Valley, or what not, as the ultimate badge of success; but which isn't really worth very much for this instructor who now is thrown in this mass course. If he is a person with imagination, if he has been able to demonstrate some feeling for creativity in his career, then he may survive this process of transition. But we really just take the student, train him in this Germanic technique, throw him in, and then say swim. Sometimes he does, but the reaction you get from the student body is that he frequently sinks. Of course, if you don't use the technique of examination here of the teacher's success in the classroom, the only thing you get is the indirect reports from your students. Don't go back home and quote me, but I would say that about half of the people in our department can teach very well and the others get by.

Prof. Snell: You rate well. (Laughter)

Prof. Kelly: The truth of the matter is that I was bragging!

Prof. Perkins: I want to endorse highly what Prof. Kelly has just said. I think the process of specialization is absolutely necessary -- the discipline is especially necessary.

Prof. Dunbar: Could we have a reaction from Roger Van Bolt on this question that we have been discussing? Is the problem any different in community colleges? Do you want a preparation for your instructors different from what four-year colleges or universities want for their instructors, or do you want the same preparation?

Prof. Van Bolt: Remember, we have to make this distinction between the diversified programs. There is one hazard in the junior college: striving to be all things to all men. I think this has been one of its weaknesses in the past.

To answer your question, we operate pretty much as a captive coal mine to a large steel company -- mainly the large university. We cannot go too far, but we have been able to compete salary-wise with many four-year institutions. Now, I have some reservations about this. I think sometimes when we get a man through the master's degree and we take him out into a community college or a four-year institution, he hopes and prays that he can continue with his graduate studies sometime -- that he is just getting his feet wet in the academic profession. Remember, a person in junior college has certain ambitions. He has had a taste of the Germanic tradition. He too has an article under his belt. Our difficulty has been that we cannot give him advanced courses, but we try to make up for it in other ways. This man is, however, limited in the number of institutions he can go to.

Prof. Smith: I'll be brief. I was chatting during the coffee with Prof. Strayer and he remarked about a slight controversy he had some years ago with a gentleman I will call Prof. Brown. Prof. Taylor was also speaking about some difficulties he has had with colleagues upon matters of fact and interpretation. In one of my recent Ph.D. seminars the students spent some time talking about the Namierites, about Prof. Bullock's view of Hitler as opposed to those of Prof. A.J.P. Taylor and the different ones of Prof. A.L. Rowse of All Souls College. We remember the long controversy about the medieval boroughs carried on by Prof. Tait and Prof. Stephenson and how excited the students of each became. They passed each other like volcanoes or icebergs in the corridors. Some of them still do. I have no intention of making a Sears Roebuck list on controversies here, but I did refer to a few of them because our Ph.D. students will become involved in controversies, disputes, different points of view on the makers of history and the making of history, and they will carry into the classroom many terms they will not use after they become aware of the work of the Namierites in Britain and America, and the new points of view of other scholars upon many subjects. I think that it is very important in the training of what we usually call generalists to see that they do become informed about the main controversies and differences of opinion in the world of the professional historians. This comment is a footnote to what Dr. Kelly has said.

Prof. Pattison: I recognize that there is a great diversity in the institutions that we represent and the courses that we teach, and that this is so because of the various resources we have: libraries, the competitive position of the staff, and so forth. It would be presumptuous to set up a program to try to prepare for the profession without men to satisfy these needs, but the common denominators that would be necessary to teach this course seem to be: 1) that the instructor must know his craft; 2) he must be excited about his subject; and 3) the broader his experience in teaching this course or in knowing his field, the better job he is going to do in teaching it.

Prof. Snell: Returning to the comment Prof. Kelly made about what he thought I was getting at -- a merger of something like a Germanic approach and whatever the antithesis would be. I think he was approaching the essence of what I have been trying to say, but I would not want the impression to be left that I want to narrow the scope somewhat to medium-breadth courses, as I called them, so that the student can be hooked into doing research projects on narrow subjects or learning how to put footnotes on the bottom of pages after having spent a certain number of hours exhausting the available local library material. What I am really hopeful for in suggesting this special limitation of the course is not to train freshman students in methodology or historical research. Such might be accomplished in the process, but what I am interested in is what I think would be the end goal of that historical research for all of us at any level -- what I think history courses, whatever they may be, should be aiming at if they are going to make significant contributions to the liberal arts education of our students; that is, to contribute our part to the production at the end of four years of education of a questioning, rational, critically analytical person. I don't think the usual Western or world civilization course allows time for development of these attitudes.

Dean Schaefer: I want to respond to Prof. Dunbar's question by a piece of empirical information. He asked if the preparation of teachers for different kinds of institutions should differ. I think one piece of information bears on this question: the mobility of teaching personnel. I was quite surprised, for example, two years ago when I discovered that in Wisconsin and Minnesota, 77 percent of the college teachers had prior experience in elementary or secondary schools. Now, I think what that suggests is that you cannot expect a person trained for a specific job to stay there.

Prof. Snell: I have just one comment to what Prof. Van Bolt said. If I remember the statistic correctly, about one-third of all students who enter junior college go on to their junior and senior years at some other institution. I think this is highly relevant to any consideration that might be given to devising a particular freshman course for junior colleges or a program for training instructors for such a course at a junior college.

Prof. Van Bolt: I think that statistic could be misleading. In a junior college there are diverse programs, including those for one-year technical students. I would want to be sure that some of these students are not included in your statistic.

Prof. Snell: I think the complete statistical rundown that I recall is that, of the total group entering the junior college, one-third don't finish junior college, one-third do and stop, and one-third go on to a senior college or university.

Prof. Van Bolt: I think there are more recent statistics on the percentage of successes and completion of a four-year institution. I think this is relatively high in some institutions, probably our state institutions, and it is getting higher all the time. -- But to comment on whether we should train for a specific purpose, it seems to me that we would be running a risk: the danger of turning out a specialist, so called, which would be not unlike the problem facing the engineering profession now. The engineer technician is a technician and nothing more. Now, do you want historical historians or historical specialists? You would be training a technician rather than a historian. I think this is the inherent danger.

Prof. Wallbank: I feel the kind of training that Dr. Kelly suggests and what I have in mind would in no way limit a person's adaptability as he grows into his profession. I think that this general orientation in the field of civilization, no matter whether you go into American history or later on into some other discipline, would limit you. I started out as a constitutional historian under Dr. William Morris at Berkeley, and then as I came along I developed other interests and now I am ending up giving a course in the history of India, and a course on the history of Africa. But I don't look upon my initial training as a limiting exercise, but rather a foundation which has enabled me to grow into these various fields. -- I also want to ask Dr. Snell, isn't he piling upon the freshman course, whatever it may be, a rather large burden? Now, I am all in favor of the development of a critical faculty, of understanding multiple causation, but we historians have three years after that, particularly if the student does take an additional history course, and I don't think that in one single year you can achieve the kind of critical faculty, the rational operations of the mind that Dr. Snell would ask. I think it is too much to ask of this single course.

Prof. Taylor: In regard to this matter of the training of instructors, I would like to add a footnote on the developments in the Canadian scene. I think I indicated earlier that the Canadian universities were, before the war, really undergraduate colleges in large measure, and instructors were products of an English tradition, in large measure, in which the gifted amateur concept perhaps wes highly esteemed. Then we went Germanic after the war, progressively, and called for more Ph.D.'s on the staff. Now we face the fearsome prospect of having a campus explosion in the next ten or fifteen years and a drain-off of Canadian brains south of the border so that the rest of us will have to stay on the northern side. The problem, of course, of preparing for this is causing some alarm in the establishments. Dr. Bissel, President of the University of Toronto, announced that his institution will take an unusual step; it is going to offer, in addition to the normal Ph.D., a new degree, Master of Philosophy, to help meet the growing need for university teachers. A step above the master's degree, it will provide an alternative route into the teaching profession by emphasizing scholarship rather than original research. I don't know what it is going to mean in terms of status, but at any rate this will be concerned much more with equipping the future instructor with pedagogical understanding of the problems and with requiring a broader base in the field of interest, but he will not be concerned with the traditional approach of digging in depth in terms of a specific thesis. It is hoped, apparently by Dr. Bissel and his associates, that this will be useful in helping to stimulate the production of future college instructors. Again, pedagogically it might do very well because in Canada there may be some desire to go back a little more towards the gifted amateur, rather than the young gifted professional.

Prof. Dunbar: I don't know whether any of the others here have encountered the same problems we have here on our campus with this whole matter of general education. There is a great deal of ferment here in this area, and there has been a prolonged study of general education in the last two years. Now those who are interested in general education are constantly telling us, in history, that these general education courses which are required, although there may be options, should not be introductory courses to our particular discipline; that they should somehow be of a different character from the courses we offer in the history department. I don't know whether any of the rest of you have come into contact with this thought. Certainly, Prof. Thomas can tell us whether this is the general view or not.

The other question I would like to raise is this: do the people that you hire to teach Western or world civilization lack, in many cases, knowledgeability, particularly in the arts, that is not so important in other fields of history? For example, you bring in a person whose specialty is diplomacy in the 19th century to teach history of civilizations. Do you find such people qualified to deal with the Renaissance or Greek Art? This bothers me.

The other thing that bothers me is this insistence from the general education people that this course should not be history; it should be something else. I don't know that they know what else, but they certainly don't want it to be history. Do any of the rest of you encounter this? Is this a common experience?

Prof. Thomas: It certainly is one of the attitudes. There is considerable disagreement about the proper character of civilization courses. In part it is tied up with the larger problem of deciding whether history is properly a social science discipline or a humanistic discipline or neither, i.e., an archetypal discipline which is exercised in all fields of intellectual inquiry and provides a mode of integrating human achievement in all fields. The different points of view toward the organization and instruction of courses in Western civilization, world civilization, and area studies reflects these basic differences about the role of history in general education. I think the evolution of the general education curriculum at the University of Chicago illustrates the operation of these differences.

In 1931 when the University first adopted a general education program which included four basic courses required of all students, one of those courses was called "An Introduction to the Humanities." It was a historically oriented course and was described as a course in the history of Western civilization. An interesting point was the manner in which the course was constructed. The initial planning was in the charge of a committee of three faculty members; one, a professor of history, another a professor of Romance languages, and the third a professor of philosophy. Early in their planning they secured several young instructors -- able graduate students -- from the departments of history, English literature, and philosophy who were released from instructional duties and given a full year free to prepare for teaching the course. Another member of the history department was chosen as chairman of the staff. The idea was that the course should not be a conventional history course. As initially conceived, instruction proceeded through lectures (three per week) and discussions (one per week), a pattern that has become fairly conventional. After a few years, the lectures were reduced to two and discussions increased. Most of the lectures provided the historical narrative of the development of Western civilization, emphasizing political, economic, religious, and intellectual change as well as continuity in Western society from Sumerian civilization to the present. Basic texts supplemented the lectures. Some lectures dealt with specific intellectual and artistic achievements. The discussions were not concerned directly with the lectures but were directed to specific works in art, in poetry, drama, fiction, philosophy, histories, etc. All members of the staff participated in the lecture program; they met regularly in weekly staff meetings to discuss the works which were the basis of each week's discussions, and cooperated in preparing the common comprehensive examination given at the end of the year to all students. This course existed for ten years, and it was usually taken in the freshman year.

A sweeping revision of the general education program in 1942 brought an end to this course. Dean Clarence Faust held a different view about the teaching of history than most professional historians. He had small regard for the sweeping generalizations about historical movements and periods which characterized most civilization courses. So in the reorganization of the curriculum, history in the conventional sense was no longer a part of the program. There were two courses in the new program, however, which might be regarded as novel approaches to problems of history. One was a social science course which was concerned with critical issues in the development of American political and social institutions. The method was to study primary documents critically which concerned some crucial issue in American life. Thus, the crisis centered around the adoption of the Constitution was studied through analysis of the Constitution, the Federalist, and other documents relating to the issues. The other course was a humanities course in which one quarter was devoted to the critical reading of a selection of historical works: e.g., Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, Gibbon, Burkhardt, Taylor, Toynbee, Tawney, Michelet, Trotsky. Instruction was directed to the arts of historical interpretation and the different applications of these arts by different historians. This quarter was placed in the context of two other quarters which were devoted to the arts of poetic interpretation (drama, fiction, narrative poetry) and to the arts of philosophic interpretation.

In 1948, by action of the faculty, a required history of civilization in the general education program was reinstated, but with a new stipulation, namely, that students should not take the course until they had completed two years of humanities and two years of social science. The intention was that this course, rather more conventionally a history course than the original humanities course, should be one of two "integrating" courses. The other was a course, philosophical in orientation, concerned with the organization, methods, and principles of knowledge. For a few years the staff of the history course was drawn from instructors in both the humanities and the social sciences, many of whom were not professionally trained as historians. In the last few years, however, this course has been staffed almost entirely by historians. If it has gained something in the professional competence of the staff, it has, in my opinion, lost something by withdrawing from a much closer association with the staffs of other courses which also have an interest in history both as a subject matter and as a discipline.

We want the students to understand what distinguishes history as an "art" from poetry and philosophy. We want them to gain a first impression of the differences as well as the similarities in the works of different practitioners of the art. We are concerned that they see a distinction between the "facts" of history and the kinds of interpretations which historians (legitimately) condensed from these facts. This kind of education is, we believe, a valuable addition to the study of the "history of civilization."

Prof. Maier: We must, of course, draw this discussion to a close. I think it would be the feeling of this conference, then, that although pedagogical elements would be involved in the preparation of instructors in the history of civilization, or any other history course, nevertheless a special graduate program would not be indicated, nor would a terminal degree. Does that faithfully reflect the opinion of this conference? -- Fine. We will conclude the morning session here and resume at 1:30 P.M. after lunch.

* * *

Prof. Maier: During this final session of the conference, we become eminently practical and ask, in effect, "Where do we go from here?" By way of introduction, Dr. Dunbar has a few remarks.

Prof. Dunbar: Now that we have an answer to the question to which Prof. Schaefer addressed his remarks this morning, and I think we have that answered pretty clearly, the question we want to explore now, I think, is "can a contribution be made through a study of how to improve this course in Western or world civilization?" Is there need for such a study? If so, how should we go about it, what guidelines would you suggest, and what particular topics do you think we should explore? I think we have had some suggestions in our discussions. For instance, questions like this: Is there widespread dissatisfaction with history of civilization courses? If so, is there any consensus on a desirable substitute? If these courses are to be retained, how can they be improved? Should Eastern civilizations be integrated with Western civilization in a combined course? These questions have been discussed at some length here, with a rather sharp difference of opinion in some cases. I think such questions might be explored further. What do you think? Tell us how you think we could best proceed.

Prof. Maier: The conference agenda suggests our discussion topic at this point as follows: "The development of guidelines for a contemplated national research project to seek the improvement of courses in the history of civilization." Please don't be intimidated by the adjective "national" here, but our intention is to lift these concerns beyond the attention of fifteen or twenty authorities, and involve more across the country who are similarly concerned with these courses, both as department heads and as faculty.

Dean Schaefer: I think it has become clear that there is no sense of uniformity or standardization about this course. The constant emphasis is upon the particular design of the course according to the particular stress and the background of the individuals who are teaching it. In your contemplated study, I think special care ought to be taken to relate questions about the course to these attendant circumstances at a particular institution.

Prof. Maier: Quite so. We are dealing here with a congeries of courses, really, not one course. The expression, "history of civilization," is really a catchall which intends to comprehend all these. But now, how do we thread our way through this multiplicity of offerings in order to present something that may be of value to many institutions across the States? You see, the interest of the United States Office of Education, through its curriculum improvement program, is primarily in determining how these courses on a general basis, nationally, can be improved.

Prof. Taylor: From your assessment of the conference tapes, it is conceivable that a pattern may emerge of one or two alternative ways in which this could be structured. I go back again to past as past and past as prologue, two perhaps different ways in which this whole thing can be approached. On the basis of that assessment--in which you may wish to adumbrate different guidelines toward the formulation of courses in different ways -- you might then perhaps circulate the results to a cross-section of instructors in this country, and also including Canada, asking them in turn to react to it and to continue with further refinement in the way of guidelines for suggesting alternatives. Then submit one or two models, if you wish, for them to react to. After all, if the behavioral disciplines can engage in model-making, why can't we? This might be one way to elicit responses that would be of some interest to the Office of Education.

Prof. Wallbank: In carrying on with what Dr. Taylor has said, I think it would be most valuable if the panel could think through and propose a number of alternatives; for example, we have the alternative of a Western-strand, two-semester offering. Then we have another alternative which is the world-civilization strand. Then, in addition to that, there is the prospect of possibly a separate non-Western civilization course which would be added to the two-semester, completely Western strand. But I think that no one of these alternatives should be regarded as a universal solution, and that nationwide, various areas will react in terms of what they feel to be the best choice. Undoubtedly, the needs of junior colleges would be different, for example, from those of a very large university. If it were stated that the following alternatives have been discussed, and that we would be interested to learn their reaction, it would be worthwhile.

Prof. Perkins: A course depends on the personality who will give it, but I do think that a study will show important things. When I mentioned in my opening remarks the fact that the course at Rochester and at Amherst were given by the same men for a generation, Prof. Strayer, I think, dissented. I would like to know whether a course of this kind, on the lecture side, cannot command the loyalty of a highly competent scholar over a long period of time.

I would like to know about the question of recruiting. Is it difficult or easy to recruit people for the sections? Are they adequately rewarded? Is it sufficiently dignified? In other words, there are questions that can be fruitfully examined in an investigation of the courses, though I am thinking a little more from the point of view of administration. I think that from the point of view of the conduct of the course, it won't teach you very much.

Prof. Maier: Do you think it would be valuable for a local department head somewhere, who is thinking of improving, or modifying, or dropping the course, to have some kind of rundown on the way this course is generally structured and taught nationally?

Prof. Perkins: I do think so.

Prof. Maier: This would necessarily involve, then, statistics to some extent, and also the use of -- there's that nasty word -- questionnaires. To what extent would drawing up a questionnaire be justified? What kind of response could we anticipate? Here the experiences of Profs. Perkins and Snell would be valuable, because undoubtedly you had to deal with such research instruments in your own study.

Prof. Perkins: Well, I am affirmative about the possibilities.

Prof. Dunbar: Prof. Snell tended to stress the interviewing in preference to the questionnaire. Am I correct?

Prof. Snell: A questionnaire might be needed as a preliminary move, but the interviewing, I think, would be tremendously important. The person who directs it should plan to visit at least forty or fifty places for one day each at least. They should be selected carefully in order to get a representative range of institutions: community colleges, four-year colleges (some small, some very large), and universities.

If you do interview, be very unstructured. The less specific questions you ask, I would think, the better. Just walk in and say to the instructor or chairman of the department, "What is wrong with the civilization course, and what would you do to meet the problems?" Then listen to him talk.

Prof. Maier: We planned on using both methods. We thought the general questionnaire would be valuable to provide a broad indication of what is being offered, how it is generally being taught, what the ratio is between lecture and discussion sections, and this kind of thing. But we very definitely wanted to include research by personal interview, since the creative ideas, the suggestions for improvement, I think, would derive far better from such interviews than from the antiseptic blank space in the questionnaire which asks suggestions for improvement.

Prof. Snell: See if you can't arrange to sit in on a section of the civilization course.

Prof. Buss: Mr. Chairman, what do you expect to get from a questionnaire?

Prof. Maier: Answers to some important questions, I think, and not merely structural and statistical data. From our crude preliminary questionnaire, we learned of some rather interesting experiments taking place in this course. Quite a few department heads voluntarily added a whole supplementary letter explaining what they were trying and how it was working, and the like, wonderful nuggets of information which we thought we could get only by personal interview.

Prof. Dunbar: Another thing we would like to know is to what extent this course is used as a general education course and how much merely as an introductory course in the history department. To what extent is the course required of all students? Is it used to fulfill some university requirement for graduation?

Prof. Buss: Couldn't that be done better by studying catalogs?

Prof. Bruun: Better still, don't a number of publishing houses have that information from their field representatives?

Prof. Van Bolt: Wouldn't it be worthwhile, if it could be done, to broaden the base of the interviewing to people in the institution who are not directly concerned with the world civilization course? What is its relationship to the institution? How do the people in general education, for example, feel about it?

I also think that the survey, in the interviewing techniques, should include some of the lesser members of the department who are actually engaged in teaching the course. We are often prone to go into a department of an institution and talk to one or two people and assume that this represents the consensus, when it doesn't.

Prof. Thomas: I would like to stress very emphatically the importance of interviewing, not just the staff that is teaching the course, but faculty members in various fields.

Prof. Taylor: Does your questionnaire envisage asking questions in regard to the value of teaching methods, such as standard texts or paperbacks, or visual aids of one sort or another? In other words, why have a course that in many institutions happens to be geared to the textbook simply because that is the textbook, but nobody is really satisfied? It might be better, as a result of the kind of evaluation in depth that you are engaging in, if the textbook writers could be told how they ought to make a much more teachable and pedagogically valid text, in turn.

Prof. Dunbar: I sense, Dr. Maier, some antagonism to the whole idea of questionnaires. I think that ought to be stressed, if that's what you Gentlemen feel, that the questionnaire is of very doubtful value.

Prof. Buss: I feel that way.

Prof. Perkins: I don't think we can say that. John, do you?

Prof. Snell: Maybe we should ask Al Kelly. He is one of the people who suffered under the infliction of our questionnaire. My answer would be, a lot depends on how carefully constructed the questionnaire is, how fruitful the questions are, how pointed they are, and how easily they can be answered by the people you ask to answer them.

Prof. Perkins: I'm sure we profited a lot.

Prof. Kelly: I have to make a horrible confession at this point, John. The first thing I did with the damn questionnaire was to throw it in the wastebasket. Then I got a personal letter from Dexter saying, will you please take this one and fill it out. We really need this. This isn't just another interview.

Prof. Snell: I did a good job of forging your signature on that one, Dexter. (Laughter)

Prof. Kelly: I thought that if this is on a professional-personal basis, I'll have to take care of it. My first reaction was that it was another blankety blank questionnaire and I threw it away. Frankly, I am right on the edge of rebellion against these things, so I would say that they are really a curse of the academic world.

Prof. Snell: And yet how could we ever have collected the data that is in that book? You may say, why should we have?

Prof. Kelly: No, I have to concede that the book is very useful.

Prof. Snell: Our questionnaire was too long. Those which went to the departments that had Ph.D. programs had thirty pages or so. Keep it brief.

Prof. Kelly: I have an underlying sense of skepticism of these things, unsupported by the follow-up personal interview and by the confirmatory sources of information that you may use also. Even when you decide to fill out a questionnaire, you take your pencil and say, "Oh, well, what the hell." So you start scratching through it, and it doesn't really represent deep thought, in many instances. You feel imposed on by things of this sort. Maybe I am alone in my revolt against these things, but I think this is a quite general academic attitude that I have portrayed here.

Prof. Snell: I think the response of the majority was annoyance. Believe it or not, one or two chairmen wrote back and said, "First I was terribly annoyed, but I am really grateful now for this questionnaire, because it suggested to me the kind of data we should be collecting."

Prof. Hahn: Do you think people would feel less imposed upon by the personal interview? That might require a great deal more of their time than filling out a questionnaire.

Prof. Kelly: They feel less imposed upon because you have flattered them.

Prof. Snell: This is true.

Prof. Perkins: In our study, of course, personal visitation followed the questionnaires. How many places did you visit, John?

Prof. Snell: I visited about twenty, but I think with this kind of project, you need to visit a good many more.

Prof. Perkins: That is true.

Prof. Snell: You don't need to spend as much time at each one. I think one day would probably do it, but I think that you ought to visit at least forty or fifty places.

I think it would be tremendously helpful, if you do undertake such a study, if you could persuade the Council of the American Historical Association to co-sponsor it. This might even make it more appealing to the Office of Education. -- If you do make this study, you will be rendering a service to the profession, nationally. It is not just going to be a Western Michigan University project.

I'm satisfied that our much higher return of questionnaires was due to one thing: the fact that this was a study sponsored by the American Historical Association. The people on the committee commanded a lot of respect and a lot of cooperation, as Prof. Kelly has indicated. If you just write from Tulane University or from Western Michigan, or any other university, you are not going to get that kind of cooperation. If you could get the A.H.A. as co-sponsor -- I don't know if that would be feasible or not -- you would have won a large part of the game at the outset.

Prof. Maier: That is a most potent observation. -- I do want to emphasize this point: this study project, from its very inception, was never intended as something to benefit Western Michigan University alone. Because the civilization course is so widespread, we were very concerned that historians across the United States be concerned too. And to this extent, the idea of a liaison with the American Historical Association is superb.

Prof. Thomas: I have one question about the mailing list. Are these questionnaires going to be addressed to chairmen of history departments, or how wide is your coverage? The reason I raise the question is that there are going to be some institutions in which a course of this sort will fall within the general studies faculty. If you send it to the chairman of the history department you get one answer, and if you send it to someone else you will get another. Your preliminary study of a wide range of catalogs could find out something about the administrative structure of the institution.

Prof. Dunbar: Several of you have prefaced your remarks with "if you make this study." I would very much like to know, and I think we all would here, if there is a real need for this project. If it is just a convenient way to spend government money I am for forgetting it. Do you think there is a real need for such a research project?

Prof. Wallbank: Mr. Chairman, I think there really is a great need for this study. Thousands of students are involved. Now, if these students are being led down the garden path -- they are not getting what they really should get out of the basic course -- then we are doing them a great disservice. There is sufficient dissatisfaction, I think, to raise the question as to whether or not changes and modifications should be made. My own feeling is that certainly we would be doing a great service in this study, because if we find out that in the main, people are fairly satisfied they may suggest certain modifications. It means a reinforcement of this course, and we are happy to know that. On the other hand, if we discover that the course is universally criticized and that it has so many weaknesses, we must search for a substitute. Here again there would be pedagogical gain.

Prof. Snell: I think such a study would be quite useful if it is very objectively planned. I hope it would be appealing to the A.H.A. I think it ought to be designed not only to find out how people think the course can be improved, but I think the survey instruments ought to embrace this more fundamental question of whether this is the best basic college-level history course. I think probably there is more questioning of the desirability of this as the basic introductory course than our conference would tend to suggest. I'm not sure that we constitute a fully representative group of historians on this point.

Prof. Maier: What department of the A.H.A. would you suggest we contact, Prof. Snell?

Prof. Snell: You should write, I think, to the Executive Secretary and let him take it to the Council.

Prof. Strayer: May I suggest that the Committee on Teaching would be interested in this too, and that quite possibly the Council would want to refer it to the Committee on Teaching for advice. I can assure you, I think it is worth doing and I'm the chairman of that committee.

I would suggest one other thing, again from the point of view of the Committee on Teaching. It would help if the chairmen could discover what previous experience in history their students had had. This, I think, is essential and it would answer some of John Snell's problems and some of mine, because if the high schools really did a good job in any kind of world history, then we could begin to put the freshman course at this middle level that John is talking about, rather than trying to do the whole job. The total of my experience is that most of my students have not had a survey of this sort before, but I would very much like to know if this is generally true.

Prof. Sullivan: I think that it would be valuable to conduct a study such as seems to be described here, though, if you are thinking about the problem of improvement, the research must go deeper than simply a poll-taking operation. I wonder, for instance, if you don't have to examine such questions as, "What are the assumptions that lie behind teaching such a course?" "What do we consider to be the basic intellectual processes involved in digesting this kind of material?" How can you reform a course without getting down to such fundamentals? A thoroughgoing research program should probably bring in experts who may not even be historians to consider pedagogical problems of this kind. I'm thinking about the point Prof. Kelly made this morning, that this is an operation which is somewhat different from our research activities. I think we have never examined carefully enough what is involved in this special activity.

Prof. Snell: The investigation ought to, if at all possible, try to determine whether the benefits of the course are really genuine and valid. You can only do this, I think, by talking to the student and asking him questions, and by trying to find out what he really did get out of the course.

Prof. Dunbar: You mean students who have had the course?

Prof. Snell: Yes, or at the very end of the semester or year.

Prof. Maier: This is very important; I'm glad it was brought up. Should student opinion be canvassed? Your answer, apparently, is affirmative. The next question will be, how can this best be done and at what stage?

Prof. Snell: Don't just ask the students, "Do you think this is a good course or a bad course?" A large number of them will say "yes" and a large number of them will say "no". Find out what they really got out of it. They may think it was a good course for all the bad reasons.

Prof. Taylor: Then you need some kind of check. You'd better have them react also to some other course that they take. You may find that they have a negative view regarding all the offerings in that department.

Prof. Snell: Prof. Taylor, I think we're not going to study all the courses.

Prof. Taylor: I know that, but then what you have done is to prejudice the results. You have to be able to employ some kind of a statistical check against them.

Prof. Sullivan: Prof. Schaefer, are there instruments for doing this kind of thing?

Dean Schaefer: You need a specialist for this task. You can certainly get this kind of help on checking and controls of statistical manipulations from the psychology department or from different people in the education department.

Prof. Snell: Ask students, for example, whether they know why civilizations rise and why they fall. If they answer "yes", you'll know it was a bad course. (Laughter)

Prof. Strayer: I think there ought to be a gap. The opinion of a freshman at the end of his first year is not a very informed one, and also he doesn't know yet whether the course has done anything to him. I'd rather get students about five years later, and the question I would ask them would be, "What magazines and newspapers do you read regularly?" If they are not reading anything except the local newspaper, and the sports and society pages in that, then the course has been a failure. It hasn't given them an interest in the continuing process of human history.

Dean Schaefer: How do you take out the countervailing influences, such as job pressure or family pressure, and so on?

Prof. Strayer: I think it is a very difficult thing.

Prof. Kelly: This thing is shaping up as more formidable in size by far than the already rather considerable project that Profs. Perkins and Snell carried out. I think you need technical help of a different kind than that which historians alone can give you. It is perfectly obvious that what you are running into is all kinds of problems in personal-opinion polling, and these in turn run on into the whole area of statistical probability and distribution. I think you need a very good social science statistician and someone trained in public opinion polling. They should not have control of the process, but they should be technical advisors.

Prof. Dunbar: Prof. Thomas, how can we contact the general education people that you spoke of?

Prof. Thomas: That is best done by personal interview.

Prof. Dunbar: An interview, in each case, with the person who heads the general education program?

Prof. Thomas: Yes, but also with the members of the faculty involved in teaching the relevant parts of the curriculum.

Prof. Morell: Entirely aside from considerations of course improvement involved in this study, the mere fact of surveying the status quo is very helpful in achieving improvement. Our first concern when we were debating among ourselves some years ago about how to improve the course here was a check on how other schools handled the course.

Prof. Smith: Gentlemen, we have been talking about a Western civilization and a world civilization course. There are really a great many of them under that title. Many are certainly controlled closely by the textbooks that are used. There is a Strayer course, a Wallbank and Taylor, a Bruun course. I am certain that the class in many colleges is largely controlled by chapters one through fourteen, the structure, the table of contents, the emphasis. We are talking about far more than a single course, so I don't know if such a study would be desirable.

Prof. Strayer: I would think that every textbook is written with chapters that you hope are going to be omitted. Mine was. Mine was expanded because the publisher told me to put in additional chapters. It seems to me that the imaginative teacher does not go through the textbook from chapters one through fourteen. They leave some out, and they may rearrange the order of others. They will, I hope, use some supplemental reading. So I doubt whether the textbook has quite as much control as Prof. Smith suggests; at least I hope it doesn't have that much control.

Now, the fact that there are fifty different ways of doing the course is going to be a problem. But I think you may find that while there is a scattering, things will fall into categories that can be reasonably defended as being separate categories.

Prof. Bruun: The statistics that Prof. Taylor gave us on Canadian colleges seem to be relevant, and I can't but wonder whether in this country we have anything of approximate accuracy in the educational yearbook or from the Office of Education in Washington as to how many colleges give a civilization course or the equivalent, and how many give a course since 1500? I just wonder whether such information may be available, perhaps quite easily available, and if so whether it would be relevant at this point of the discussion.

Prof. Maier: Profs. Perkins and Snell have several references in their Education of Historians book to the incidence of this course, but not under such separated categories as world history, Western civilization, and the like. In this connection, do you have any material which was not included in your book, but is relevant to our concern?

Prof. Snell: We still have the questionnaires in New Orleans, so you could check through them and determine which institutions taught a history of civilization course. Remember, we don't have questionnaires from all the colleges. We made a sample. I suspect you should try the Office of Education, which might just have a list on hand.

Let me also suggest that in the survey you make an attempt to identify certain generally reputable colleges and universities that do not teach the civilization course at the freshman level, and find out from them why they do not.

Prof. Taylor: Does the Office of Education have computerized the calendars of the universities in terms of course offerings? Have they statistical or other data that you could call on?

Prof. Dunbar: We were quite severely criticized by the general education people here for bringing up this matter of the large number of institutions which offer a two-semester course in civilization because we omitted any question of whether the course was required. In other words, we had no way of identifying whether these courses were introductory courses in history or courses in general education, something that was required or as an alternate requirement in the field of general education. I think that is a very important thing to determine, because if you consider the civilization course in terms of an introductory course in the history department, that is one thing; but if you think of it in terms of general education for all your students, some of whom will never take any more history, that is quite another thing. That is something that you have to find out.

Prof. Snell: I think it is very important to check with people outside of history departments about these things, but I would hope that the great weight of the report would be on the opinions of the people in the history department. They ought to be the ones to say what kind of course is best offered to the student who can take in his college career only one year-long course in history. Physicists wouldn't tell the economists what type of basic principles of economics course to offer; that would be left to the economists. I think maybe we as historians might at times tend to be too prone to testing the wind and trying to sense what our other colleagues think about what we should do. We are not just a service department. We ought to have something to say about what type of history is best for the students.

Dr. Robert Sullivan: I have felt something like an outsider, primarily because you historians seem to understand one another, but I am having difficulty in understanding what the point of this research project would be. Is it to be a research project that would somehow list the opinion of professors of history of civilization on the efficacy and the weaknesses of their course? Would it be somehow to test the student's satisfaction with the course, or to determine if there was any change in his knowledge, his skills, his understanding of the art of history, or his values? Would it be a basic study which would be a pilot program for the development of a doctoral program whose mission is to train people to teach history of civilization courses? -- You have already discussed the techniques that would be used in a research project. Any one of the techniques is good. It all depends on the questions you want answered. You discussed questionnaires. One of the first cautions about questionnaires is, use the questionnaire when you can't find the information anywhere else. I believe you should use catalogs and other devices before you use interviews. Interviews are very tricky. You have to know the question that you are asking. You also have to know what stimuli the interviewee is responding to. -- So I think perhaps it might be well for me to have someone explain the focal question of this conference. What are you trying to do? What would this research project share with the rest of the historians in the country?

Prof. Maier: We would be seeking answers to precisely all the questions which you just listed, with the exception of this question: "Would this study be a pilot program for a doctorate?" We are no longer interested in any special doctoral program in the history of civilization. That was brought out clearly by this conference. We are now in the process of formulating areas which must be covered in this research project. The work of our committee this summer will be to play back the conference tape several times and learn the general consensus as to what kinds of questions ought to be asked in research instruments. We will prepare these and send you sample copies for your criticism.

Dr. Robert Sullivan: I was suggesting that before you begin to think in terms of areas and questions to be included in your questionnaire, you might find out really what you want to know.

Prof. Dunbar: One of the things we wanted to know that was quite crucial has been answered rather positively, namely, is there something to be said for a special kind of preparation for teachers of civilization courses You have given us a pretty unanimous answer to that. The other question that we are concerned with is the improvement of the civilization courses. Now what you have added to that -- and I think very legitimately so -- is the question of whether there is widespread dissatisfaction with this course, and if so, is there any consensus on a desirable substitute.

Secondly, so long as the course is taught, what can be done to improve it? I think that is where we are now as I see it, Dr. Sullivan.

Dr. Robert Sullivan: I wonder whether you have thrown out the doctoral possibility or a training program for professors of world civilization.. It has been suggested in other quarters, not about world civilization, that the Ed.S. degree or certificate is useful in this type of situation in junior colleges and in liberal arts colleges teaching survey courses.

Secondly, I wonder if before you ask about how to improve history of civilization courses, you follow the distinction Prof. Buss made between Western and non-Western civilizations. You might also try to find out the types of history of civilization which are middle-breadth courses, close to what Prof. Strayer is teaching, as compared with those which go from Adam to the end of the world. Depending on the types of courses, you'll get different opinions about whether they are effective or not. -- Now, having gotten opinions on the limitations, how do you weigh them against the strengths? See, you are asking about improving the teaching of world civilization, which implies that world civilization is sort of a single thing. Actually, it is probably more of a multiple thing. Secondly, when you find out what people object to, how do you know how serious the objections are? Do you have anything that you can weigh them against, for example, the strengths?

Prof. Buss: It seems to me that when you attack this problem as your own problem here, I am in accord with your procedure. When you move to a nation-wide basis, you are getting into deep water.

If you were to come out to Stanford and talk to our men for a day, you would only get a glimpse of what we understand our own problem to be. If you think that you are going to get even the grasp of the problems that we have been facing inside of a day, you can't do it. If you are going to go across the next day to Berkeley and try to see what they are up against and then go somewhere else, your poor interviewer is going to be a physical wreck at the end of nothing flat. What is he going to derive from this as a national problem? I think you will come out with a consensus that preparing teachers for Western or world civilization isn't something that you train for; you begin by turning out a person who is a master of one discipline or another.

Prof. Maier: We realize this. At the same time, we think it would be valuable to learn of Stanford's experiences with civilization courses, so that its successes could be shared. -- Now, as far as covering the nation is concerned, I would say that on the surface of it, Profs. Perkins and Snell had a much larger project to undertake, in that they were evaluating the teaching of history in general across the nation, rather than of just one course in history, as in this project.

Prof. Buss: Well, come along. You will be welcome, I assure you. We will be delighted to see if you can find answers for which [illegible] have been searching a long time. We have immense problems that we have been wrestling with for years, and I am not sure that we are any further along, now in 1964, than we were in 1946 when I first began to teach at Stanford.

Prof. Wallbank: Are all the members of the staff who teach Western civilization historians?

Prof. Buss: Yes. This is the service function. The catalog says that this is a general education course. The history department meetings all say that this is an introduction to the discipline of history. There is a slight difference here, but this is a history department monopoly, much to the objection of a few, non-history members of the faculty.

Prof. Snell: There is another situation too that I suspect exists at a number of places. Let me put it in the form of a question. Do the people who teach this course make the basic decision as to whether this is the best course to give as a basic course in history?

Prof. Buss: No. -- Naturally, the content varies in its details from year to year, largely as the result of the previous year's experience.

Prof. Wallbank: For a period of about twenty-five years, we were able to keep our original history of civilization course despite the history department. I very well remember the dean insisting that this was not supposed to be a traditional course in history. The philosophy was that every student would take this course. There was a kind of revulsion on the part of the dean particularly against what he thought was political history, the fact that historians were not giving to the average student the sort of inter-disciplinary enriched survey course -- it might be rich even though it was superficial, Dr. Snell -- and the idea was to introduce concepts such as culture diffusion, culture lag, etc. which had not usually been given to the average student. So we had considerable difficulty in recruiting men from the history department. They were consistently opposed to what we were trying to do.

Last year, we did have a fragmentation. I hope the victory of the traditionalist is short lived, because I do believe that the average young men and women going out into the world are not history majors. Here is a type of course for them which is historical and chronological in its development, but is something a little different from what we might call the traditional course in history. Previously, we also had a special beginning course for our history majors, so there was a differentiation, you see.

Prof. Pattison: To comment on Prof. Buss' remarks, I doubt if we are presumptuous enough to think that we are going to find the answers to your problems, for instance, at Stanford. But I do think there is some value in discussing, isolating, and clarifying just exactly what these problems are. Through this type of an analysis of problems, we are going to be in a better position to improve our courses.

Dr. Rob. Sullivan: It really sounds to me as if you are talking about two research projects, when you get right down to it, and I don't seem to make a connection between them. Number one is a survey of what is going on. I think some very valuable information would come out of this, but I wonder how this really has anything to do with improving the teaching of history of civilization. My suggestion is that if I were thinking of a project for improving the history of civilization, it might not be to take a poll as to what is going on everywhere, but to get together a group of people who have an interest in this and a talent for it -- consultants of various kinds, historians and non-historians -- and attack some of the problems that are really at the heart of the whole business of teaching history of any kind. It seems to me to be quite a different operation than learning what is being done at nine hundred schools, or something of this kind.

Prof. Maier: You are correct in pointing out that there would be at least two or three major aspects of our survey project. It would have to determine what is going on, so far as this course is concerned, what is wrong, and how to improve. I want to point out also that we would not simply be dealing in the mail box. I am sure that the larger project, if it is approved by the Office of Education, would convene conferences such as this to deal with the problem of improvement once the results were in.

Dr. Rob. Sullivan: I think that you would confuse the whole thing by trying to combine all these things into one complex questionnaire.

Prof. Maier: Except for the fact that you have to know how the civilization course is being taught before you can think of improving it.

Prof. Pattison: You clarify problems before you come up with solutions, don't you?

Prof. Snell: I would like to comment about the national survey. It seems to me that good would be accomplished if it did nothing but stir up a great deal of thought and re-examination of the one course that we are most likely to have the opportunity to present to college students. We have been going along for twenty-five years or so with this course being fairly standard. Maybe we should go on the next twenty-five years with this course being fairly standard, offered in seventy per cent of our colleges and universities, or whatever the statistic was. But I would plead with this group to put our approach to this subject in general academic perspective. College teaching of mathematics has been critically re-examined in the last ten or fifteen years by the mathematicians and it has been changed fundamentally. For the teaching of physics the same thing is true. The teaching of biology is now undergoing a real revolution at the undergraduate level. If there is anything that I fear about any kind of pursuit -- as historians, as citizens, or what have you -- it is complacency and smugness, and a sense that we don't need to question what we have got, to consider what else we might get. I think a fundamental questioning approach to this could have only useful results. I would still say that, even if the results were positive and gave absolute endorsement to the continuation of the course. (Laughter)

Prof. William P. Viall: I think this reference to math and science is a very good one, because most of this process has not been done by questionnaires. It has been done by experts getting together who actually work in the field. I would suggest that your questionnaire might be very brief, just to find out what kinds of courses there are and what their problems might be. Then I would bring together those who offer different kinds of courses and different kinds of presentations to set them to work over a period of time to develop some guidelines for these courses.

Prof. Thomas: One of the things I would like to know is the attitude among the different colleges in the country about the responsibility or qualifications for instruction in a course of this kind. Do colleges think it should be within the province of the history department alone to teach it, or should the staff be drawn from other departments in the social sciences and humanities, or perhaps even the natural sciences? This might give you some insight into the way in which they define the history of civilization.

I would avoid questions which merely invite opinions about the success of such a course. The answers will only provoke more questions which you cannot follow up.

One of the problems is to find out what the real substance of the course is. This is not easy. In other areas of general education -- the humanities, for instance -- I have secured descriptions of courses from different colleges which look very much alike; reading lists seem to be nearly identical. But further inquiry showed that one course was historically oriented and related readings to the cultural background of its time; another course emphasized the appreciation of the forms of literature and art; and another emphasized ideas, that is, the universal themes such as the idea of freedom, or the conflict of science and faith, etc. To get at such differences, I don't know any sure method other than by direct approach to the people who are doing the teaching.

Prof. Bruun: In seeking information, a possible source would be the American Textbook Publishers' Institute. This is not, of course, a publishing firm. The group as a whole has a national organization. The Institute might have statistics and they would almost certainly be interested to the extent of being glad to assist in making information available for such a wide survey as you contemplate here.

Prof. Maier: Your comment, Prof. Bruun, reminds me of one area that perhaps we should not overlook in this study: canvassing our students -- graduate and otherwise -- for suggestions for improvement of this course. As a matter of fact, you took this up with one of your graduate classes, didn't you, Prof. Bruun?

Prof. Bruun: I asked the students for suggestions as to how they would like the teaching of history improved, and some of the ideas were quite ingenious. One suggested something equivalent to a juke box, a recorder that would play back the great speeches of history; another recorder for the great poems of history, with the addition that it play a few stanzas of the original language followed by a translation; that would give it some flavor. -- Other ideas included something equivalent to a telephone booth, where students can go in and dial a repeat on any lecture they had missed. (Laughter)

It bears out Prof. Taylor's point that we live now in a world of machines where students are well aware of all these gadgets and what they can do. One student said, "why do you have to erase things on the blackboard? It would be a very simple matter to have a blackboard that would go blank on touch and you could write again. Turning your back on the class and writing is a waste of time, and the class can copy three times as fast as you can write on the board. Anyway, it is bad psychology to turn your back on the class." Now I have a feeling that all this criticism shows a functional feeling for the efficiency of classroom teaching. In mathematics they have a little gadget on which you can write and it is thrown up on the board immediately. Why don't they do that in history? I think you should consult the students. If a way can be found to do so, we might get some surprisingly helpful replies from the students themselves.

Prof. Kelly: Taped lectures which can be listened to again have become a standard technique in our experimental college at Wayne. All of the regular lectures are taped and students can go back and listen to those lectures, and they not only do this, but they do it constantly. Those tapes get a very heavy play, not merely from students who have cut the lectures, but from those who feel that they want to get the feeling of the lecture. This technique has proved highly successful. Obviously, you have to have good lectures to do this.

Prof. Bruun: We only taped, we did not video-tape the lectures. But, just as you said, several students who did not miss the lecture were interested enough to come back and ask the privilege of putting on the ear phones to hear the recording over again. The students' interest in all these gadgets is very keen, and they do appreciate any aids they are given.

Prof. Dunbar: I would like to explore Prof. Strayer's comment a little further, his suggestion that this research project be co-sponsored, I think he said, by the Committee on Teaching of the American Historical Association. Would the natural course be to entrust the matter entirely to your committee?

Prof. Strayer: All I was suggesting was that it would be a good idea to have the sponsorship of the American Historical Association, and projects of this sort are often referred to the Committee on Teaching. Now, our committee is desperately anxious to get something like this started at the secondary school level. Therefore, we would be interested, I think, in your project. It may give us answers we want, and it might also be an excuse to push our own plans more successfully than we already have. No, I am not suggesting co-sponsorship, but simply that our opinion might be asked. My inclination is to be favorable to it.

Prof. Dunbar: If such a favorable reaction should be given, we could then count, I presume, on the guidance of your committee on the project.

Prof. Wallbank: If, for example, this went through and the committee really did become interested, if there were some kind of a write-up announcing the inauguration of the exploration in the American Historical Review, it would give it dignity and advertise it, and interest people all over the country.

Prof. Strayer: The procedure would be, of course, that the Council of the American Historical Association would have to approve or show interest or something of this sort. If the Council did this, I should think the natural place to have it appear would be in the Newsletter, where such announcements are customarily made. This would acquaint people, and would be a good preparation for your questionnaire.

Prof. Taylor: If your committee, Prof. Strayer, undertook to participate in this way, would this narrow the terms of reference to an examination within the department of history or the discipline of history, as Prof. Snell, I think, indicates it ought to be? I can think of one type of course offered in the traditional introductory history framework, and another which is really social science-oriented. I am wondering whether your committee would still be interested in proceeding along such lines. Or, by the acceptance of involvement, are you prepared to narrow in advance the framework of this survey course?

Prof. Strayer: Well, I assure you that the situation on the secondary-school level is perhaps much more complicated. In the secondary schools you have the thing called social studies and you have all sorts of deviations from what we consider normal. Our committee certainly is interested in this and has always felt responsibility for a course that included history in any form. I do think, however, that you are exaggerating the role of the committee. As I say, we would be glad to give advice. We are glad to send a representative to a conference, anything of that sort, but this is certainly not a job that the committee could undertake and participate in as a group.

Prof. Perkins: Mr. Chairman, I think some of us may not be here when the meeting resumes after the coffee break. I'm sure I express the sentiments of all the members of the panel in expressing our appreciation that an invitation was extended to us and our satisfaction in this exchange of views which was very fruitful, even if it hasn't arrived at a complete consensus. (Applause)

Prof. Strayer: I have one more thing to add to Prof. Perkins' statement: this is one of the few conferences I've attended where I haven't been bored! (Laughter)

Prof. Maier: Thank you very much, Prof. Perkins and Prof. Strayer. -- We adjourn until 3:15 p.m.

* * *

Prof. Maier: We were discussing the ground rules for a contemplated national research project for improving history of civilization courses. May I clarify, at this point, the function of the committee for the rest of the summer? [Dr. Maier described the future activities of the committee.]

Prof. Kelly: I would like to give you the results of something that I just penned off. This is really not useful to you, but it may indicate directions in which a questionnaire might run.

I thought in terms of categories. The first category, I should think, would be a descriptive category, and it in turn has two general areas -- different people will classify it differently, of course -- first, there is the question of the present structure and content of such courses. You ask those questions which concern the various alternatives we talked about yesterday; for example: "Is it a Western civilization course or a world civilization course?" You ask the question of "time-depth," and you get the question of whether or not the course uses the national or the cultural approach, and so on, all of those various eight or ten alternatives I tried to deal with yesterday.

Then there is also in the "that which is" a category of external circumstance. This has to do with all of those questions which are peripheral but vital to the course: how do you staff it, how do you use graduate students in this course? Do all of your regular tenure people teach in this course; if not, what category of exclusion and inclusion is used? What problems in staffing do you encounter in connection with this? And so on.

Then there is the problem of articulation. How does this course articulate in the process of general education in your college curriculum? How does it articulate in the process of courses offered by your history department? Whether these are history courses or general education courses has to do with the problem of articulation. This seems to me a "that which is" which ought to be answered.

There is also the question of textbooks, a great range of questions here. There is the question of participation by graduate students in the course.

Then, as a second whole category you have that which is implied in the observations which have been made by Prof. Snell: the category of validity, the whole range of inquiry as to whether this kind of course is fundamentally worthwhile. One can set up ten or twelve different propositions which raise the basic question: "Is this after all worthwhile in the education process?"

The third category I would set up, if I were constructing such an inquiry, would be what I would call the category of the "ideal." Here I would try to find out what people, in their experience with this course, thought were the basic philosophical alternatives they were dealing with and how they believed they ought to be solved, rather than how they had attempted to solve them; how in their own minds they came to the best. In other words, you would be asking them what is the good, so to speak. Here you would range over eight or ten philosophical objectives to try to get them to express these alternatives that we have talked about.

Prof. Dunbar: I think all of us here at Western have a sort of horror that we are going to let you go home and fail to pick your minds on some matter that is very crucial to our inquiry. If I may, I would like to go back for just a moment to a matter that may have seemed settled this morning, namely, the matter of the preparation of instructors for such a course. It was partly reopened in my thinking by the talk that Prof. Schaefer and I had over lunch. We have quite a few students completing our master's degree program who may not go on for the doctorate, but who seem to hold promise of being good teachers. Is there anything to be said for what you might call a "sixth-year course" for such students, particularly with reference to junior colleges, which would present graduate work in history that might be particularly directed toward the civilization course and which would represent some wasted time, perhaps, if and when the student went on for his doctorate, but perhaps not altogether. Is there any validity to that sort of suggestion for an institution like ours?

Prof. Cochrane: I think it is a very interesting suggestion. The point has been made very often that most people in American universities who teach history, or other disciplines for that matter, do not generally publish; that is, they don't turn out to be active scholars. Graduate programs, for good or for bad, are specifically for producing scholars, even though generally they very often do not do so alone.

The humanities division at the University of Chicago has just worked out an arrangement with a number of small liberal arts colleges in the mid-West which will offer an M.A. after a program in which students will spend two years finishing the work at the liberal arts college and then come to the University of Chicago to take their work on the M.A. The supposition is that this M.A. would enable these people to teach in a liberal arts college, people who are very competent in several different areas of a particular discipline, but who don't necessarily make scholars. The supposition is that these people would make very good teachers who will be extremely useful to small liberal arts colleges, but would not necessarily be the kind of people who have to write a book every three years in order to keep their position in the faculty.

Prof. Strayer: It seems to me this sixth year would be excellent for a purpose different from that suggested: this would help a great deal with the preparation of good secondary school teachers. You know I have my own special axe to grind. I want to see that secondary school course improved, and we have been talking at Princeton in these terms. We feel we don't produce enough men who go into teaching; of course, there is a shortage of men teachers anywhere. We thought of something much like this as preparation for a man who could become a good history teacher in a secondary school. I do fear that if you think this is going to work in a liberal arts college, you'll find that it isn't too successful. All American education is being upgraded. We growl and complain about it, but it is a lot better than it used to be. The high schools are better than they used to be; high-school history courses, especially American history courses are better than they used to be. Therefore the small liberal arts college which is now quite satisfied with a man who has taken only the M.A. and has no ambition to go further very likely won't be satisfied with him another ten years from now. Then you run into this same problem of where does he go? But as a type of preparation for a superior secondary school teacher it can be very good.

Prof. Dunbar: What about community college?

Prof. Strayer: Or community college.

Prof. Sullivan: Isn't this actually happening now, that many people are going out after six years and taking jobs before they finish their doctorate? It seems to me that if you can give this some kind of structure at this particular stage, you wouldn't be performing a disservice. Something is happening now in a kind of haphazard way.

Prof. Strayer: Well, if you did it in the form of one or two courses with a special aim at this problem, this I think would be useful not only to the six-year student, but the man who is going all the way.

Prof. Van Bolt: I believe at one time the University of Chicago attempted a variation on this by requiring, I believe, for the master's level three fields and no thesis. This was a "terminal M.A.," if you want to use the word. I remember at the time it did not have a great number of takers, and I presume it did not continue.

Prof. Cochrane: The particular program I was talking about has just begun. Nobody thinks it will work very well. The supposition is that students by the time they have their M.A. will then be inspired to go on for their Ph.D.

Prof. Snell: Isn't that really the reason for the interest in it at Chicago?

Prof. Cochrane: Most of the small colleges participating in the program would insist that these people end up with a Ph.D. at some time anyway.

Prof. Thomas: I think that is true. There is one very popular program in our humanities division in which the student can get a master's degree in general humanities. The base of that provides for introductory courses in four areas: music, art, history, and philosophy. This really amounts to a three-year program: junior, senior, and one year beyond. It is a sort of pyramiding program which leads to a thesis in the master's year, which relates to two areas. Now, frankly, the men who are in charge of this program recognize that they do face a problem in placing their graduates in collegiate teaching positions. There is some demand for these students from junior colleges and occasionally as freshman instructors in general humanities programs, where the students have to work their way up. Most of these are going on into graduate work elsewhere anyway, and they will continue to get into an ordinary specialization.

Could I say one more word about this matter of specialization as opposed to generalization? First of all, project your imagination five hundred years hence to the problem of the history teacher at that time dealing, let's say, with modern history; what is his specialization going to be? Well, it certainly is not going to be European history in its present definition, because he could not possibly deal with the problems which will be presented to him either in economics or in politics, and restrict him to that level. Something is going to happen in our humanistic fields and social sciences that is not altogether different from what has already happened in the natural sciences. The specialization of a physical scientist, for example, is not what it was twenty-five or thirty years ago. You can't tell now whether you have a geophysicist, a physical chemist, a chemical physicist, a biological physicist, or a biochemist; they are all mixed up. We have new forms of specialization and we are going to have them in other areas as well. The sort of thing that you are asking about might be, not whether you are going to begin training people for a general course, but whether this is the beginning of recognition that there are going to be new kinds of specialization.

Prof. Wallbank: Prof. Dunbar, have you investigated the supply and demand situation in relation to these smaller liberal arts colleges? At the present time, it does seem that there would be a place for people with the sixth year. I would say that would be a very worthwhile thing to do. As to what Dr. Strayer suggested, I have no idea whether there will be a general lifting of standards for all college and university teachers. Some say that there will be a very, very serious shortage of teachers in all four years.

In the State of California, we have been able to demand rather high qualifications because our salary schedule is rather good--quite a number of junior colleges, I think, go up to $11,000 now--and so I tell my students they have no chance of getting into a junior college right now without a Ph.D.

Prof. Dunbar: In response to your question, Dr. Wallbank, we have in Michigan, and I know this is the case in many other states, many community colleges that are relatively small but have pretty high standards. I don't think for a moment that such institutions will be interested in members of their permanent staff who do not have the Ph.D., or are not well on their way. More such colleges are undoubtedly on the way. They are going to get bigger. In fact, with the volume of students we have in our colleges here in Michigan, this is the only conceivable way we can possibly take care of the demand for college training, because I don't think there is any other way that higher education can be financed in this state.

Prof. Van Bolt: In some areas the junior colleges seem to be additional thirteenth and fourteenth years in which the high school teacher is upgraded. I think Prof. Strayer is worrying about this along with secondary education. On the other hand, what is going to be the source of the teacher in this kind of institution, down from graduate schools or up from high schools? What kind of instructor you want can't really be determined until you find out what the role of the junior college is going to be in a given state.

Prof. Dunbar: Well, as you forsee it here in Michigan, do you feel that in the next five or ten years the junior colleges of this state can be staffed with people to teach this course who are pretty solidly Ph.D.?

Prof. Van Bolt: I am very skeptical.

Prof. Snell: That, I think, would not be the most pertinent question. I think the most pertinent question would be, would such a junior college, if it had the choice, choose a graduate from such a six-year program or an "A.B.D." from the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. My guess would be that they would rather go for the person who is in the doctoral program and who had completed all the requirements except the dissertation, rather than turn to a product of a program of this kind.

Prof. Van Bolt: This has been the case at many institutions, and to be honest I think it has been fifty-fifty, depending upon local conditions. -- A factor that has to be recognized is that the community college is being regionalized, and the ties with the local school system are in many cases being weakened. The ones that have been formed in the last three years have been on a regional basis. With this kind of regionalization, I would think that they would go on considering themselves, more appropriately, higher education.

Prof. Kelly: Willis, we have some empirical evidence on this sort of thing. I'm sure our circumstances are limited, but this might be of some value to you. About seven or eight years ago, Wayne put into effect, by cooperation between the school of education and the liberal arts college, a master's degree in the teaching of ----, which was intended to be specifically a community college master's degree certificate program. Now, it never did work very well.

Prof. Dunbar: We did it, Al, and it didn't work for us either.

Prof. Kelly: It didn't work very well at all. Two or three things went wrong with it. In the first place, the school of education didn't give us very good cooperation on it; the mechanics of inter-college cooperation were poor. I don't know whose fault it was. I saw it from the liberal arts point of view. They might have seen it from the other point of view.

The second and more serious difficulty was that the students who came into the program were inferior. I have a kind of horror of creating an academic proletariat. There are too many tendencies in this direction already in our profession, and this is another one. I don't like it. I like us all to be brothers together. The people who came into this program were very definitely not the kind of people whom you would want for your brothers, in the academic sense of the word. It sounds frightfully snobbish to say that they were riffraff; they weren't quite that, perhaps, but they were not people whom we would want to put our blue seal of approval on as the best beef we turn out. There was always something seriously wrong with them, Willis.

Prof. Dunbar: Yes, but, Al, to revert to something you said this morning about the German ideals of scholarship. With the need for instructors in higher education, I can't conceive how we can turn out enough scholars in the next generation to meet the needs of all these institutions.

Prof. Kelly: This may well be.

Prof. Dunbar: And I don't know if I can conceive of quite enough dissertations, and the usefulness of enough dissertation, to --

Prof. Kelly: My argument is negative rather than positive. I didn't mean to provide a final answer to the question, but merely to provide a certain piece of empirical evidence for your use. -- You know that the state law on this was modified about eighteen months ago, and it largely knocked out what was left of this program. As far as I am concerned, it did this constructively: the instructors who are now going into junior colleges have only a straight master's degree in the technical discipline. We have found that we have been rather successful in placing people who are rather far along on their Ph.D.'s. Again I introduce this invidious observation that they may be people who have faulted slightly, who in a certain sense feel that perhaps this is a little safer haven for them than trying to sail all the way on this rough sea that they have gotten into, but we have people who have gone two and a half, three years in the fellowship program for the Ph.D. and then have ended up in one or another of these institutions and frequently have done very well indeed. I'm not sure that this particular technique is the answer to the question. Rather, I think, the answer probably lies in the direction not of the creation of an inferior degree, but the alteration of the character of the degrees that now exist, a different shaping of the training to some degree away from the purely Germanic tradition.

If you argue that you aren't going to staff all these junior colleges, I would say, let's re-invigorate the conception of the master's degree. Master's degrees have been downgraded so badly in American universities that some of them, to be blunt, have simply become worthless. Many are the fifth year of an inadequate four years of education. Some are products of a peculiar combination of additional course work, and nothing of a Germanic tradition, and nothing of a new pedagogical ideal. Perhaps the answer is the reinvigoration of the master's degree and the alteration of some of the inner content of the Ph.D. program itself.

Prof. Van Bolt: I would agree with Prof. Kelly. -- We haven't talked about another program at the secondary level that seems to be catching on, the Master of Arts in Teaching, where a student takes four years of purely academic work and then a fifth year in professional-type courses. Now, if we would go into a specialized program, such as we have talked about here, first, we would set up different standards of admission, and I think this would be inherently bad. Secondly, we would be running the risk of offering this new degree as a consolation prize and thereby lowering the whole standards. The Master of Arts in Teaching was brought about because this had happened in secondary teaching.

Prof. Dunbar: The only thing that distresses me about all this is that you have closed the door, you see, on any alternatives for universities like ours, except going the full distance and inaugurating a Ph.D. program in history, or else staying where we are, which presents, without going into detail, a great number of problems. Taking your book as gospel, Prof. Snell, we don't want to go the full distance; we don't think that there is a need for it. But I don't know what the alternative is, if any.

Prof. Cochrane: Wouldn't the alternative simply be to prepare people for the master's degree and then send them to another institution that already has a fully developed program? University of Michigan is not very far away. You would take some of the burden off Michigan because you educate students for the first year of their Ph.D. program.

Prof. Snell: I don't know what the problems you refer to are, but I have a good idea of what they are in many institutions. In some cases it is pressure from the administration, in others state political pressure. Now, I know what one or two institutions in the South have done in trying to meet this. I think of one case very specifically where the institution had set up Ph.D. programs in education and in English. The president was really breathing down the neck of the history department, and the history department said to the president: "Here is a copy of a book written by Perkins and Snell;

look on page so and so and you'll see what they say is needed in the way of a library for a Ph.D. program. Get us the money, and we will give you your Ph.D. program." (Laughter)

Prof. Pattison: Rather than talking about Western's problems or the community college problem in Michigan or even the mid-West, I suspect that this committee and the project ought to be more interested in pedagogy, for instance. How are we going to gain information about how these courses are taught in the classroom? I am wondering if Dean Schaefer would have any comments about that.

Dean Schaefer: Not directly. -- I have one comment to make here, which relates to the questionnaire. I wonder if we can't get at some of the assumptions that we have made here about the appropriate preparation of the teacher. For example, it was said that there is no necessary dichotomy between specialization and the ability to deal with this reference material. We might ask what specialization does the person have who is giving this course, or, secondly, what evidence of this specialization is apparent? If you can get at such assumptions through the questionnaire it would be useful.

Prof. Maier: It would be very helpful to our committee if at this point you Gentlemen could answer a rather strange yet, I think, appropriate question, and that is, who else might have been at this conference? You see, we can follow this up by sending transcripts of the conference, as you have edited them, to outstanding authorities whom we overlooked or who could not attend.

/A list of additional authorities was suggested./

Prof. Dunbar: Could I ask Prof. Thomas, is there any association connected with general education that could assist us in this connection?

Prof. Thomas: I don't think so. Just off hand I would say no.

Prof. Maier: Outside of your own, what universities or colleges are, shall we say, famed across the country for their history of civilization courses? Where are the outstanding courses being presented?

/Here, a list of institutions which are noted for such courses was suggested by the consultants./

Prof. Snell: Why not some problem cases?

Prof. Maier: Good! These also. This was my third question: what universities or colleges do you know where the civilization course has been a failure, or where serious difficulties are encountered with it?

Prof. Kelly: I'm a little bit worried by the way you have the question worded. The real question is not what departments have taught a bad course, but rather, what departments or institutions, having taught such a course, have decided that this was not the correct approach to this kind of a problem, and therefore either abandoned or radically modified their base of operations?

Prof. Maier: This is a better question. Fine.

[Here followed a discussion of the restated question. -- Finally, the question of dissemination of the results of the conference was raised. It was agreed that participants in the conference would be sent verbatim transcripts for their editing, after which a final edited transcript would be sent to various authorities in history of civilization who were not at the conclave, and whose comments on the transcript would be a valuable extension of the conference. The U.S. Office of Education, of course, would be sent a requisite number of copies of the transcript.]

Prof. Dunbar: May I just say that we are most grateful to all of you for coming. To me, this has been a most exciting conference and one of the most fruitful I've ever attended. It has been full of ideas which will provide much to chew on for some time to come. I doubt if any of us were ever bored. Thank you so much for coming!

Prof. Cochrane: May I move a vote of thanks to Mr. Maier for conducting these sessions so efficiently?

Prof. Maier: Thank you, Prof. Cochrane. And Gentlemen, we thank all of you very much for your excellent and spirited participation. -- If there are no further questions, this conference is adjourned.

* * *

After transcripts of the conference had been sent them for editing, participants were given the opportunity of providing an optional concluding statement. Following are those statements received.

Prof. Bruun:

In summing up, I would like to endorse three considerations in particular which have been advanced during these lively and valuable discussions: 1) The civilization course is the best -- and often the only -- course that gives the student a time-scale and helps him to "know his centuries." 2) Its value as a liaison discipline is exceptionally high, and this value can be increased greatly if a conscientious effort is made to relate important figures, events, and discoveries discussed in other courses to their historical setting provided in this course. 3) The general history course provides the best available bridge between the sciences and the humanities -- the best means for narrowing the gap between C. P. Snow's "two cultures."

Prof. Wallbank:

As in so many instances of academicians in conference, our conclave was not able to come up with any general consensus, but it did usefully crystallize some of the basic issues pertinent in evaluating the function and the future of the now very general offering in the history of civilization. The main issues seemed to be:

(1) Must the course be limited to Western civilization?
(2) Or shall it encompass some of the significant features of Afro-Asian history?

(3) Recognizing the great mass of material involved, and the resulting complexities of organization and presentation, should the existing course be discontinued? Its place would then be taken by offering the choice of various historical segments -- such as ancient history, Latin American history, the Far East, Modern Europe, etc. Such courses, presumably, would offer more depth in treatment and concentration in subject matter.

In commenting on some of the implications inherent in these questions, I would like to make the following observations.

There is an urgent need in our colleges and universities to give our young people a non-specialistic overview of the historical development of their contemporary world. Such an objective involves three considerations: 1) a general understanding of how Western civilization unfolded; 2) the same for the Afro-Asian world; and 3) by the use of "cumulative chronological emphasis," an understanding of those great events and movements in the near past that bear directly on the nature and course of contemporary civilization.

This impelling need for what Prof. Kelly called "Mass Man" in our colleges cannot be met by the traditional approach in our history courses. It requires new objectives and new techniques. It is natural and desirable that historians, within their craft, should be concerned with emphasizing such features of historiography as multiple causation or the problem of ambiguous legacies. Or, as Prof. Snell put it, history courses should "get the student aware of the way in which historians work; the problems that a historian confronts; the problems that he as a student and he as a layman for the rest of his life should be aware of...."

These are the distinctive values of history as a discipline. But the course we are examining has a broader, less-specialized, and more interdisciplinary quality. It is not just a course in history. It is in essence an experience in general education. Its function is not to be an introduction into the methods of history -- although, of course, this may always be a by-product -- but rather to afford acquaintance with the most significant happenings of the past as they bear upon our present pattern of civilization. History is not studied so much for its own validity -- the past as past -- but for the "past as prologue to the present," as Prof. Taylor emphasized.

A knowledge of Western civilization is certainly a rich and functional foundation for the college student to acquire; but it alone is not sufficient as he attempts to orient himself into the complex world milieu of the 1960's. I was disappointed that the conference spent so little time discussing the urgent need for some acquaintance with the cultural achievements, outlook, and history of the Afro-Asian peoples. Perhaps the most significant happening in the mid-twentieth century is the emergence of this vast majority of the world's non-Western peoples. They are going to be heard, they will play an increasing role in world affairs, and they must be understood.

The need for some acquaintance with the history of the non-West was generally accepted by most conferees, but its inclusion in the civilization course was apparently ruled out, because the offering, generally only Western, is already overloaded with material. Notwithstanding this difficulty, I subscribe to the view -- outlined at the conference -- that it is possible to present a meaningful continuum of real world history whose central core may still be European civilization, but with significant segments of the

Afro-Asian tradition included. Such an offering would necessitate discarding some of the much-loved and long-taught elements of Western history. In general, it would mean discarding peripheral minutiae and the central emphasis now so often placed upon parts instead of wholes and configurations. Too much attention, for example, has been placed upon the rise of the nation-state in European history. This movement could be presented more functionally, in which national history would be merged into a single political development. Much could also be done in "going right across the board" of world civilization. The genesis of world civilization could be depicted as a single movement, together with the valid cross-cultural fertilization in four river valleys, instead of examining them as disparate and unrelated parts. Such reorganization would make the history of mankind more meaningful and at the same time provide more space for the story.

Because of the plenitude of the material involved, suggestions have been made that the present course in the history of civilization be dropped and its place be taken by courses covering a narrow spatial and temporal field. Such a move, of course, is in line with developments in the natural sciences where specialization rules the day. Prof. Kelly made reference to history as a "synthetic discipline" and also to its genius residing "in its syncretism." Prof. Bruun also referred to the fact that the function of world history is to "de-parochialize the student." Segmentation and specialization in the history of civilization would destroy these meaningful values and constitute a retrograde step. The argument that the history of world civilization is too difficult to teach within the span of the prevailing two semesters, that it must lead to superficial treatment, and therefore has no value, comes down to a *reductio ad absurdum*. If it is impossible to teach in colleges, how much more impossible it is to teach in our high schools with students who have far less background and sophistication than when they enter college.

The problems posed at our conference do not lend themselves to simple answers. The transcript of our proceedings amply attests this fact. There is an impelling challenge calling for bold rethinking and new approaches, so that history in its fortunate and distinctive role introduces young students in college to their civilization.

PRECEDING PAGES MISSING

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Designed for Use in a Project to Improve
College and University Courses in
the History of Civilization

* * *

Covering letters should accompany Questionnaires HCP 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 9. HCP 3 is to be distributed after interviews with staff members. HCP 4 and 5 provide an introductory explanation on the questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 1

/This is intended for the chairman of the history department in each accredited college, university, and junior college in the United States./

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number.

I. YOUR PRESENT INTRODUCTORY COURSE

1. Institution______________________________City_________State_____.

2. Please write the name (and number) of the introductory course which involves mainly the study of history taken by undergraduates in your institution:____.

3. This course extends over 1__, 2__, 3__, 4__, 5__, 6__ semesters___, or quarters___.

4. Which of the following best describes the scope of this course?
   ___ history of Western civilization
   ___ world civilizations (including part or all of the non-Western world)
   ___ Europe since c. 400 A.D.
   ___ Europe since c. 1500 A.D.
   ___ Ancient history
   ___ Medieval history
   ___ American history
   ___ Other (please specify:)_______________________________.

5. If the course is world civilizations, check if the history of the following areas is included: Far East___; Africa___; Latin America___. If included, are they covered through lectures___; discussion sections___; textbook___; assigned collateral reading___?

6. If a two-semester course, what is the approximate breaking point between the two semesters? 1400-1500___; 1550___; 1600___; 1648___; 1714___; 1789___; 1815___; 1870___A.D. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

7. Indicate the number of credit hours a student earns by completing the course: 1__, 2__, 3__, 4__, 5__ hours per week for each of the semesters or quarters the course is given.

8. May all the credit hours earned in this course be counted toward a major in history? Yes___; No___. Toward a minor in history? Yes___; No___. May part of the credit earned be counted toward a major or minor in history? Yes___; No___.

9. Is this course required of all history majors? Yes___; No___. Is it required of all history minors? Yes___; No___.

10. Is this course required of all students for the B.A. degree? Yes___; No___; for the B.S. degree? Yes___; No___. Is it one of two or more alternative courses which a student may elect to fulfill a degree requirement? Yes___; No___. May some other history course fulfill this requirement? Yes___; No___.

11. Please list any alternatives to the course described above which the student may take to satisfy an institutional requirement for the B.A.:____.

12. Do you have a division of general, basic, or liberal studies at your institution? Yes___; No___.

13. Is your introductory course (specified under 2 above) and its staff under the supervision of:
    ___the history department, entirely___; partly___.
    ___a division of general, basic, or liberal studies, entirely___; partly___.
    ___the social sciences division, entirely___; partly___.
    ___Other department or division (please specify:)________________.

14. How well prepared to teach this course do you think staff members are when first appointed? Very well prepared___; Adequately___; Inadequately___.

15. What portion of the staff teaching the course earned their highest degree in history? one-fourth___; one-half___; three-fourths___; all___.

16. Assuming instructors and assistant professors are Group 1, and associate professors and professors are Group 2, please check the following:
    ___a much higher proportion of 1 than of 2 teach this course.
    ___a somewhat higher proportion of 1 than of 2 teach this course.
    ___the number from 1 about equals the number from 2.
    ___a somewhat higher proportion of 2 than of 1 teach this course.
    ___a much higher proportion of 2 than of 1 teach this course.

17. What fraction of the staff teaching this course are graduate assistants? one-fifth___; two-fifths___; three-fifths___; four-fifths___.

18. Do you feel that graduate students should be involved in teaching the civilization course? Yes___; No___. If yes, for budgetary reasons___; or to provide teaching experience for graduate assistants ___?

18. Do you find recruiting competent instructors for this course (above the level of graduate assistants) very difficult___, moderately difficult___, easy___ ?

19. Do you feel there should be any limitation on the number of years an instructor teaches this course? Yes___; No___.

20. Is history of civilization, or some comparable course, offered at

the junior or senior level? Yes___; No___.

21. Which of the following best describes the attitude toward the course of those who teach it? Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical___.

22. Do members of the staff meet regularly to discuss and plan the content and presentation of the course? Yes___; No___. If yes, do these meetings include: lecturers only___; discussion leaders only___; both___.

23. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the general attitude toward the course of students who have taken it? Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical ___.

24. Are large lecture sections and smaller quiz or discussion sections of the course scheduled? Yes___; No___. If yes, are all or most of the lectures which a student attends in a given semester or quarter delivered by the same lecturer? Yes___; No___.

25. If a distinction is made between lecture sections and quiz or discussion sections, how many times a week does a student attend the lecture section? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__; 5__. How many times a week does he attend the quiz or discussion section? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__.

26. Is a textbook used? Yes___; No___. If yes, is the same textbook used in all sections? Yes___; No___. Is the textbook selected by the individual instructor___or staff___? Is a syllabus used? Yes ___; No___. If yes, is the same syllabus used by all instructors? Yes___; No___.

27. For collateral reading assignments, do instructors rely mainly on paperbacks___; the college or university library___; on books of readings purchased by the students___?

28. Is use made of audio-visual materials, other than maps? Regularly ___; Occasionally___; Rarely___; Never___.

29. Are any of the lectures given by closed-circuit television? Yes___; No___.

30. Are the same examinations given to students in all sections? Yes ___; No___.

31. Are essay-type questions used in final examinations___and/or quizzes___ by all___some___none___of the instructors? Check any of the following types of "objective" questions used extensively in examinations: true-false___; completion___; multiple choice___.

32. Are there special sections of the course for superior or honor students? Yes___; No___.

33. Are students permitted to satisfy the requirements of the course by Advanced Placement Tests or their equivalent? Yes___; No___.

34. Has your institution made any extensive study, during the past three years, of the curriculum in general, basic, or liberal studies? Yes___; No___. Has any extensive study been made in the past three years of the history of civilization or other introductory history course? Yes___; No___. (If published results are available, please attach.)

35. What was the average number of students last semester in
lecture sections? 10-40___; 41-60___; 61-100___; 101-200___; over 200___.
discussion or quiz sections? 10-25___; 26-40___; over 40___.
regular sections of the course (if not identified as lecture or quiz sections)? 10-25___; 26-50___; 51-100___; over 100___.

II. COURSE IMPROVEMENT

36. Please rate the following objectives of your history of civilization course by checking the "1" column beside the objective which you would consider the primary goal of the course; check the "2" column beside that which you rate second in importance, "3" for third. Mark the "X" column beside any which you reject as a proper objective for this course.

1 2 3 X
___ ___ ___ ___ To contribute to a liberal education.
___ ___ ___ ___ To impart a comprehension of historical method.
___ ___ ___ ___ To gain skills and understandings for further studies in history.
___ ___ ___ ___ To provide the student a "time-grid" against which he can correctly relate events of the past.
___ ___ ___ ___ To provide the student a bridge between various academic disciplines.
___ ___ ___ ___ To give the student an understanding of social and cultural change.
___ ___ ___ ___ To enable the student better to understand the contemporary world.
___ ___ ___ ___ To help the student develop rational thought processes.
___ ___ ___ ___ Other. Please comment on any additional significant merits and values of the course for both student and instructor not listed above: ____
____.

37. If possible, please reflect the consensus of your department and the staff teaching the civilization course on the following questions, by checking not more than 4 or 5 statements under each of the following subheads.

(a) The deficiencies of the course, as taught at your institution are:

___The scope is too broad. The scope is too narrow___.
___There are too many details for the student to absorb.
___The course lacks depth.
___The textbook is inadequate.
___Instructors are too much wedded to a specialized field.
___Students have inadequate high-school preparation for the course.

34. Has your institution made any extensive study, during the past three years, of the curriculum in general, basic, or liberal studies? Yes___; No___. Has any extensive study been made in the past three years of the history of civilization or other introductory history course? Yes___; No___. (If published results are available, please attach.)

35. What was the average number of students last semester in
    lecture sections? 10-40___; 41-60___; 61-100___; 101-200___; over 200___.
    discussion or quiz sections? 10-25___; 26-40___; over 40___.
    regular sections of the course (if not identified as lecture or quiz sections)? 10-25___; 26-50___; 51-100___; over 100___.

II. COURSE IMPROVEMENT

36. Please rate the following objectives of your history of civilization course by checking the "1" column beside the objective which you would consider the primary goal of the course; check the "2" column beside that which you rate second in importance, "3" for third. Mark the "X" column beside any which you reject as a proper objective for this course.

1	2	3	X	
___	___	___	___	To contribute to a liberal education.
___	___	___	___	To impart a comprehension of historical method.
___	___	___	___	To gain skills and understandings for further studies in history.
___	___	___	___	To provide the student a "time-grid" against which he can correctly relate events of the past.
___	___	___	___	To provide the student a bridge between various academic disciplines.
___	___	___	___	To give the student an understanding of social and cultural change.
___	___	___	___	To enable the student better to understand the contemporary world.
___	___	___	___	To help the student develop rational thought processes.
___	___	___	___	Other. Please comment on any additional significant

merits and values of the course for both student and instructor not listed above: ____
____.

37. If possible, please reflect the consensus of your department and the staff teaching the civilization course on the following questions, by checking not more than 4 or 5 statements under each of the following subheads.

(a) The deficiencies of the course, as taught at your institution are:

___The scope is too broad. The scope is too narrow___.
___There are too many details for the student to absorb.
___The course lacks depth.
___The textbook is inadequate.
___Instructors are too much wedded to a specialized field.
___Students have inadequate high-school preparation for the course.

___The course is just a rehash for students, who have had excellent high-school preparation.
___Sections are too large. Sections are too small___.
___There are too few conferences between instructors and students.
___There are no significant deficiencies.
___Others (please specify:)____
____.

(b) The changes which would most improve the course, as taught at your institution, are:
___Limit the scope to Western civilization.
___Broaden the scope to include the non-Western world.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 400 A.D.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 1500 A.D.
___Extend the scope to include the ancient world.
___Place the major emphasis on recent history.
___Make more extensive use of audio-visual materials.
___Reduce the size of quiz or discussion sections.
___Instructors more skilled in leading discussion.
___Instructors more skilled in lecturing.
___Less lecture, more discussion. Less discussion, more lecture___.
___Less reliance on textbook. More reliance on textbook___.
___Extend the course: increase its number of credit hours.
___Compress the course: decrease its number of credit hours.
___No significant changes are necessary.
___Others (please specify:)____
____.

(c) For a two-semester course, where do you think the breaking point ought to be, approximately? 1400-1500___; 1550___; 1600___; 1648___; 1714___; 1789___; 1815___; 1870___ A.D. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

38. What would you consider the most desirable structure for the history of civilization course?
___two-semester Western civilization
___two-semester, Western plus non-Western, necessitating compression of Western material
___three semesters: two Western, one non-Western
___three semesters: integrated Western plus non-Western. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

39. Which of the following do you think should be the basic course in history, the one that more college freshmen take than any other single history course, whether it is required or not? A one-year course is assumed.
___History of Western civilization
___History of World civilizations
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___European history since c. 400 A.D.
___Modern European history since c. 1500 A.D.
___Asian history
___Latin American history

___United States or American history
___A choice of several of the above, at the student's option.
___Some other course (please specify:)________________________.

40. Do you think the basic history of civilization course (Western or World) should be retained, in those institutions now offering it? Yes___; No___.

41. Do you have any remaining practical suggestions for the pedagogy of this course, experiments you have tried which proved helpful, or teaching innovations which you evolved for your own course which might be valuable for others? ______________________
____
____
____
____.

42. Please use this space for concluding comments of any kind, or for an overall assessment:

Your Name:_________________________

Title:_________________________

Date:_________________________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 2

/This is intended for the director of general, basic, or liberal studies in every four-year college or university where a division or unit of general education has been formed./

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number.

I. YOUR PRESENT INTRODUCTORY COURSE

1. Institution______________________________City____________State_______.

2. Please check any of the courses listed below which correspond to those taken by freshmen at your institution to satisfy a requirement in general, basic, or liberal studies.
   ___ history of Western civilization
   ___ world civilizations (including part or all of the non-Western world)
   ___ history of Europe since c. 400 A.D.
   ___ history of Europe since c. 1500 A.D.
   ___ Ancient history
   ___ Medieval history
   ___ American history
   ___ Other courses involving mainly the study of history (please specify:)____.

3. Indicate the number of credit hours a student earns by completing the course: 1__,2__,3__,4__,5__ hours per week for each of the semesters___ or quarters___ the course is given.

4. Is this course required of all students for the B.A. degree? Yes ___; No___. For the B.S. degree? Yes___; No___. Is it one of two or more alternative courses which a student may elect to fulfill a degree requirement? Yes___; No___.

5. Please list any alternatives to the course described above which the student may take to satisfy an institutional requirement for the B.A.:____.

6. Is the history of civilization course and its staff under the supervision of:
   ___ the history department, entirely___; partly___.
   ___ a division or school of general, basic, or liberal studies, entirely___; partly___.
   ___ the social sciences division, entirely___; partly___.
   ___ the humanities division, entirely___; partly___.

7. In your opinion, how well prepared to teach this course are staff members when first appointed? Very well prepared___; Adequately ___; Inadequately___.

8. Assuming instructors and assistant professors are Group 1, and associate professors and professors are Group 2, please check the following:

   ___a much higher proportion of 1 than of 2 teach this course.
   ___a somewhat higher proportion of 1 than of 2 teach this course.
   ___the number from 1 about equals the number from 2.
   ___a somewhat higher proportion of 2 than of 1 teach this course.
   ___a much higher proportion of 2 than of 1 teach this course.

9. What fraction of the staff teaching this course are graduate assistants? one-fifth___; two-fifths___; three-fifths___; four-fifths___.

10. Do you feel that graduate students should be involved in teaching this course? Yes___; No___. If yes, for budgetary reasons___; or to provide teaching experience for graduate assistants ___?

11. Which of the following best describes the attitude toward the course of those who teach it? Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so ___; Critical___; Very critical___.

12. Do members of the staff meet regularly to discuss and plan the content and presentation of the course? Yes___; No___. If yes, do these meetings include: lecturers only___; discussion leaders only___; both___?

13. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the general attitude toward the course of students who have taken it? Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical ___.

14. Are large lecture sections and smaller quiz or discussion sections of the course scheduled? Yes___; No___. If yes, are all or most of the lectures which a student attends in a given semester or quarter delivered by the same lecturer? Yes___; No___.

15. Is a textbook used? Yes___; No___. If yes, is the same textbook used in all sections? Yes___; No___. Is the textbook selected by the individual instructor___or staff___? Is a syllabus used? Yes ___; No___. If yes, is the same syllabus used by all instructors? Yes___; No___.

16. Are any of the lectures given by closed-circuit television? Yes ___; No___.

17. Are there special sections of the course for superior or honor students? Yes___; No___.

18. Are students permitted to satisfy the requirements of the course by Advanced Placement Tests or their equivalent? Yes___; No___.

19. What was the average number of students last semester (or quarter) in:

   lecture sections: 10-40___; 41-60___; 61-100___; 101-200___; over 200___?

discussion or quiz sections: 10-25___; 26-40___; over 40___?
regular sections of the course (if not identified as lecture or quiz sections): 10-25___; 26-50___; 51-100___; over 100___?

20. Are appointments to the teaching staff in this course made
    ___by the director of a division of basic, general, or liberal studies?
    ___upon the recommendation of this person?
    ___by the head of the department of history?
    ___by the head of the department of history, subject to approval by the director of general, basic, or liberal studies?

II. COURSE IMPROVEMENT

21. Please rate the following objectives of your civilization course by checking the "1" column beside the objective which you consider the primary goal of the course; check the "2" column beside that which you rate second in importance, "3" for third. Mark the "X" column beside any which you reject as a proper objective for this course.

1	2	3	X	
___	___	___	___	To contribute to a liberal education.
___	___	___	___	To impart a comprehension of historical method.
___	___	___	___	To gain skills and understandings for further studies in history.
___	___	___	___	To provide the student a "time-grid" against which he can correctly relate events of the past.
___	___	___	___	To provide the student a bridge between various academic disciplines.
___	___	___	___	To give the student an understanding of social and cultural change.
___	___	___	___	To enable the student better to understand the contemporary world.
___	___	___	___	To help the student develop rational thought processes.
___	___	___	___	Other. Please comment on any additional significant

merits and values of the course for both student and instructor not listed above:____
____.

22. As compared with other history courses offered at your institution, is the emphasis in the civilization course greater or less in the following areas of culture:

	Greater	Less	Same
political	___	___	___
economic	___	___	___
social	___	___	___
intellectual	___	___	___
literary	___	___	___
aesthetic	___	___	___
religious	___	___	___

23. If possible, please reflect the consensus of your staff teaching the civilization course on the following questions, by checking

not more than 4 or 5 statements under each of the following subheads.

(a) The deficiencies of the course, as taught at your institution are:

___The scope is too broad. The scope is too narrow___.
___There are too many details for the student to absorb.
___The course lacks depth.
___The textbook is inadequate.
___Instructors are too much wedded to a specialized field.
___Students have inadequate high-school preparation for the course.
___The course is just a rehash for students, who have had excellent high-school preparation.
___Sections are too large. Sections are too small___.
___There are too few conferences between instructors and students.
___The history instructors teach the course as if it were a standard history offering.
___There are no significant deficiencies.
___Others (please specify:)____
____.

(b) The changes which would most improve the course, as taught at your institution, are:

___Limit the scope to Western civilization.
___Broaden the scope to include the non-Western world.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 400 A.D.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 1500 A.D.
___Extend the scope to include the ancient world.
___Place the major emphasis on recent history.
___Make more extensive use of audio-visual materials.
___Reduce the size of quiz or discussion sections.
___Instructors more skilled in leading discussion.
___Instructors more skilled in lecturing.
___Less lecture, more discussion. Less discussion, more lecture___.
___Less reliance on textbook. More reliance on textbook___.
___Extend the course: increase its number of credit hours.
___Compress the course: decrease its number of credit hours.
___No significant changes are necessary.
___Others (please specify:)____
____.

24. How do you believe preparation of instructors for the course can be improved? Check the "1" column beside the item you consider of primary importance, "2" for secondary, etc.

1 2 3
__ __ __ More training in teaching methods.
__ __ __ More experience in teaching under supervision.
__ __ __ Broader background in the social studies other than history.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of philosophy, religion, and the arts.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of the natural and physical sciences.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of the literary and humanistic fields.
__ __ __ More preparation in the non-Western world.
__ __ __ Others (please specify:)______________________________
____
____.

25. Do you think the basic history of civilization course (Western or world) should be retained, in those institutions now offering it? Yes___; No___.

26. If you think it should be retained, what would you consider the most desirable structure for this course?
___two-semester Western civilization
___two-semester, Western plus non-Western, necessitating compression of Western material
___three semesters: two Western, one non-Western
___three semesters: integrated Western plus non-Western. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

27. Has your institution made any extensive study, during the past three years, of the curriculum in general, basic, or liberal studies? Yes___; No___. Has any extensive study been made in the past three years of the history of civilization or other introductory history courses? Yes___; No___. (If published results are available, please attach, or cite the name of the article, journal, date, etc., in which these appeared:_______________________________
____.)

28. If there are important differences of opinion between you and the department of history in regard to the course or courses indicated in Item 2 above, we would appreciate a frank statement of the nature of these differences. (Use back of sheet, if necessary.)
____
____
____
____
____
____.

29. Please use this space for concluding comments of any kind, or for an overall assessment:

Your Name:______________________________ Title:_______________

Date:____________________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 3

[This is intended for staff members teaching the civilization course at 80 selected institutions to be sampled in depth.]

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number.

I. YOUR PRESENT INTRODUCTORY COURSE

1. Institution______________________City__________State______

2. How many years have you taught the history of civilization course? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4 to 8__; more than 8__ .

3. What is your rank? Professor___; Associate Professor___; Assistant Professor___; Instructor___; Graduate Assistant___.

4. What is your highest academic degree? Ph.D.___; M.A.___; B.A.___, Other (please specify:)__________________.

5. How well do you believe your undergraduate and graduate studies prepared you to teach a history of civilization course? Very well___; Rather well___; Adequately___; Inadequately___; Very Inadequately___.

6. Please indicate the range into which your usual total teaching load falls in terms of hours per week: 6 or less___; 7 to 9___; 10 to 12___; 13 to 16___; over 16___.

7. If you teach courses other than history of civilization, are they all history courses? Yes___; No___. In a typical semester, how many other such courses do you teach? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__.

8. Would you prefer to teach courses in your special field exclusively ___; more than you do now ___; less than you do now___? Or are you satisfied with the existing division of your time between civilization and other courses?___.

9. Which of the following best describes your general attitude toward civilization courses? Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical___.

10. Check any of the following audio-visual materials which you use in teaching the civilization course:
    - ___ Maps prepared by the student
    - ___ Films or film-strips
    - ___ Slides
    - ___ Records or tape recordings
    - ___ Opaque or overhead projectors
    - ___ Copying devices for pictures, books, manuscripts
    - ___ Others (please specify:)_____________________________.

11. How many quizzes or tests, not including the final examination, do you ordinarily give in this course per semester ___ or quarter___ ? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__; 5__; 6__; over 6__. What proportion of these are full-hour quizzes or tests? One-quarter__; One-half__; Three-quarters__; All__.

12. Are students required to prepare a term paper___, brief essays___, research papers___, book reports___ for the course? If yes, how many per semester or quarter? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__; 5__; 6__; more___.

13. Please indicate how your students report on collateral reading: Oral reports___; Written book reports___; Class discussion___; Submitted bibliography___; Written test items___; Other (please specify:)____.

14. Indicate whether students are required or urged, as part of the course, to:

___read newspapers	___read news magazines
___watch specific TV programs	___hear specific radio programs
___hear recordings	___see films outside of class

15. Have you ever given any lectures for this course by means of closed-circuit television? Yes___; No___. If yes, please indicate on the back of this sheet your appraisal of the advantages, disadvantages, and potential of televised instruction in this course.

16. On what do you principally rely in teaching this course for:

	Lecture	Discussion	Text	Assigned Readings	Audio-Vis. Materials
imparting factual data?	___	___	___	___	___
making history "come to life"?	___	___	___	___	___
analysis and interpretation ?	___	___	___	___	___
general survey?	___	___	___	___	___
exploration in depth of certain topics or eras?	___	___	___	___	___

17. Are student conferences with you or your colleagues during office hours frequent___; rather frequent___; rare___?

18. How many hours per week are you usually available in your office for conferences with students? 1__; 2__; 3__; 4__; 5__; 6__; 7__; 8__; 9__; over 9__.

19. As compared with other history courses offered at your institution, is the emphasis in the civilization course greater or less in the following areas of culture:

	Greater	Less	Same
political	___	___	___
economic	___	___	___
social	___	___	___
intellectual	___	___	___
literary	___	___	___
scientific and technolgical	___	___	___
aesthetic	___	___	___
religious	___	___	___

II. COURSE IMPROVEMENT

20. Please rate the following objectives of your civilization course by checking the "1" column beside the objective which you consider the primary goal of the course; check the "2" column beside that which you rate second in importance, "3" for third. Mark the "X" column beside any which you reject as a proper objective for this course.

1	2	3	X	
				To contribute to a liberal education.
				To impart a comprehension of historical method.
				To gain skills and understandings for further studies in history.
				To provide the student a "time-grid" against which he can correctly relate events of the past.
				To provide the student a bridge between various academic disciplines.
				To give the student an understanding of social and cultural change.
				To enable the student better to understand the contemporary world.
				To help the student develop rational thought processes.
				Others. Please comment on any additional significant merits and values of the course for both student and instructor not listed above:

____.

21. What do you regard as the deficiencies of the history of civilization course, as taught at your institution? Check no more than 4 or 5:

___The scope is too broad. The scope is too narrow___.
___There are too many details for the student to absorb.
___The course lacks depth.
___The textbook is inadequate.
___Instructors are too much wedded to a specialized field.
___Students have inadequate high-school preparation for the course.
___The course is just a rehash for students, who have had excellent high-school preparation.
___Sections are too large. Sections are too small___.
___There are too few conferences between instructors and students.
___There are no significant deficiencies.
___Others (please specify:)______________________________________
____.

22. What changes do you think would most improve the course, as taught at your institution? Check no more than 4 or 5:

___Limit the scope to Western civilization.
___Broaden the scope to include the non-Western world.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 400 A.D.
___Limit the course to the period since c. 1500 A.D.
___Extend the scope to include the ancient world.
___Place the major emphasis on recent history.
___Make more extensive use of audio-visual materials
___Reduce the size of quiz or discussion sections.
___Instructors more skilled in leading discussion.
___Instructors more skilled in lecturing.

___Less lecture, more discussion. Less discussion, more lecture___.
___Less reliance on textbook. More reliance on textbook___.
___Extend the course: increase its number of credit hours.
___Compress the course: decrease its number of credit hours.
___No changes are necessary.
___Others (please specify:)____
____.

23. For a two-semester course, where do you think the breaking point ought to be, approximately? 1400-1500___; 1550___; 1600___; 1648 ___; 1714___; 1789___; 1815___; 1870___ A.D. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

24. One of the frequent criticisms of the civilization course is that it lacks depth. Please indicate on the back of this sheet any formula you use to achieve some degree of depth in the course. Do you explore some historical periods or topics in depth and skim others? Yes___; No___. If yes, kindly list below the periods or topics you study in depth:

________________ ________________ ________________
________________ ________________ ________________
________________ ________________ ________________
________________ ________________ ________________

25. In your opinion, how much knowledge of European or world history do most of your students in the civilization course possess when they enter your class? Almost none___; Some___; Considerable___; Much___. Do you have any ideas on how high schools might better prepare students for this course? If so, please state below:

____
____
____.

26. Please indicate how you think graduate schools might improve the preparation of instructors for this course. Check the "1" column beside the item you consider of primary importance, "2" for secondary, etc.

1 2 3
__ __ __ More training in teaching methods.
__ __ __ More experience in teaching under supervision.
__ __ __ Broader background in the social studies other than history.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of philosophy, religion, and the arts.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of the natural and physical sciences.
__ __ __ Greater knowledge of the literary and humanistic fields.
__ __ __ More preparation in the non-Western world.
__ __ __ Others (please specify:)______________________________
____
____.

27. Do you think it would be practical for a graduate school to offer a curriculum leading to the Ph.D. degree in the field of Western or world civilization? Yes___; No___. If such a curriculum were available, could you conscientiously recommend that students enroll in it? Yes___; No___.

28. What would you consider the most desirable structure for the history of civilization course?
___two-semester Western civilization
___two-semester, Western plus non-Western, necessitating compression of Western material
___three semesters: two Western, one non-Western
___three semesters: integrated Western plus non-Western. (If you are on the quarter system, please adapt your answer.)

29. Which of the following do *you* think should be the basic course in history, the one that more college freshmen take than any other single history course, whether it is required or not? A one-year course is assumed.
___History of Western civilization
___History of World civilizations
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___European history since *c.* 400 A.D.
___Modern European history since *c.* 1500 A.D.
___Asian history
___Latin American history
___United States or American history
___A choice of several of the above, at the student's option.
___Some other course (please specify:)________________________.

30. Do you think the basic history of civilization course (Western or World) should be retained, in those institutions now offering it? Yes___; No___.

31. Do you have any remaining practical suggestions for the pedagogy of this course, experiments you have tried which proved helpful, or teaching innovations which you evolved for your own course which might prove valuable for others?________________________
____
____
____.

32. Was your graduate preparation in history? Yes___; No___. If not, please specify your discipline:________________________. If yes, what was the field of your chief specialization?
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___Renaissance and Reformation
___Modern European history
___American history
___Non-Western history
Other:___
____
____
From what institution did you receive your highest academic degree?
____.

33. Please use this space for concluding comments of any kind, or for an overall assessment: [This will be more ample in the actual questionnaire.]

Your Name:________________________________ **Date:**______________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 4

/This is intended for a sampling of students taking the history of civilization course during the second semester or quarter at 80 selected institutions to be studied in depth./

To the Student: This questionnaire is part of a national study of how the survey course you are now taking can be improved. Your help in answering the following questions, by checking or writing in as indicated, will be appreciated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number. You need not sign your name.

Institution:______________________________
Name of your course:____

1. Which of the following comes closest to describing your attitude to the content of this course: Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical___?

2. Which of the following comes closest to describing your attitude to the presentation of this course: Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical___?

3. Do you find this course: very difficult___; rather difficult___; about average difficulty___; rather easy___; very easy___?

4. As compared with other courses you have taken or are taking, would you rate this one as: the best___; better than many___; average___; worse than many of the others___; the worst course of all___?

5. What portion of class time is devoted to discussion? One quarter or less___; about one-half___; about three-quarters___; practically all ___; practically none___.

6. What do you find most valuable about this course? Please check no more than three items:
   ___Learning about the past.
   ___Understanding how historians make conclusions.
   ___Preparing me for further history courses in specific eras.
   ___Gaining a sense of time; knowing what took place when.
   ___Learning to appreciate other subjects better.
   ___Understanding why society and culture change.
   ___Knowing how the world became as it is today.
   ___Learning how to think rationally.
   ___Others; please add any merits of the course not listed above:
   ____
   ____.

7. Check any of the following possible changes that you feel would make this course more valuable for you:
   ___If it covered more material; if it covered less material___.
   ___If sections were larger; if sections were smaller___.
   ___If it included some history of Asia and Africa.

___If it omitted African and Asian history and concentrated on Europe.
___If it included some history of the Ancient world.
___If it omitted Greek and Roman history and began with the Middle Ages.
___If the time span covered by the course were shorter.
___If the time span covered by the course were longer.
___If there were more lectures, less discussion.
___If there was more discussion, less lecturing.
___If only recent history were covered.
___If more audio-visual materials were used.
___If the course were extended another hour per week, with credit.
___If the course were reduced by one hour each week, including credit.
___The course is all right as is. The course is excellent as is___.

8. If you use a textbook, check any of the following with which you agree:
___The text is too long. The text is too brief___.
___The text is difficult to understand.
___The text is dull reading.
___It has poor organization: jumps around too much.
___It needs more maps and illustrations.
___It merely repeats what I learned in high school.
___The textbook is rather good.
___The textbook is excellent.

9. If you do not use a textbook, relying on paperbacks and other readings instead, would you prefer it if a textbook were assigned? Yes ___; No___.

10. Check any of the courses listed below which you took in high school, indicating the year and the semesters you took each:

Year:	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
Semester:	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
World history..............	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Ancient & Medieval history.	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Modern European history....	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
American History...........	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___
Other (specify:)___________	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___

11. If you took a history course in high school other than American History, do you find this college or university survey course repetitious? Yes___; No___. Do you think the course you took in high school helps you better understand this course and do better in it? Yes___; No___.

12. Do you think this course should be required for the B.A. or B.S. degree? Yes___; No___. If no, would you favor some other history course as a requirement for the B.A. or B.S. degree? Yes___; No___.

13. Do you generally earn better grades on essay-type examinations than on other types of exams? Yes___; No___.

14. If you have difficulties with this course, please check any of the following reasons which might apply:

___ I am a slow reader.
___ I have difficulty understanding what I read.
___ There are simply too many facts to absorb in one course.
___ History doesn't interest me: I don't really care what happened in the past.
___ I had inadequate high-school preparation for this course.
___ I like history, but I can't seem to be able to digest it well enough.
___ The instructor expects too much of the students.
___ Others (please specify:)________________________________
____
____.

15. Please indicate the grade which you received in this course last semester or quarter: A___; B___; C___; D___; E (or Failure)___; I (or Incomplete)___; W (or Withdrawal)___; Other___.

16. In case you would like to offer any concluding comments about the survey course you are now taking, its strengths or weaknesses, please use this space:

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 5

[This is intended for a sampling of senior students who took the history of civilization course as freshmen or sophomores at 80 selected institutions to be studied in depth.]

To the Student: You may recall that you took a course in the history of civilization during your freshman or sophomore years. Your appraisal of this course is solicited as part of a national study of how such survey courses can be improved. Your help in answering the following questions, by checking or writing in as indicated, will be appreciated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on the back of these sheets, identifying them with the item number. You need not sign your name.

Institution:______________________________

1. Did you take the history of civilization course as a freshman___, or sophomore___?

2. As you look back on it, would you say that it was
   a very valuable course___; rather valuable___; average___; of little value___?
   very well taught___; rather well taught___; average___; poorly taught___?
   enjoyable___; rather interesting___; tolerable___; I disliked it___.

3. Did you take this course chiefly because it was required? Yes___; No___. Could you have chosen a different course to meet graduation requirements? Yes___; No___.

4. Check any of the following with which you would agree:
   ___I had to memorize many names and dates which I have since forgotten.
   ___I've disliked history ever since.
   ___The course made me appreciate, even like, history.
   ___With the past explained in this course, I can understand the present better.
   ___It helped me understand how historians make conclusions.
   ___It gave me a sense of time, knowing what took place when.
   ___Through this course I felt in contact also with other subjects.
   ___It provided an understanding of why society and culture change.
   ___It helped me learn to think rationally.
   ___The course gave me a greater interest in and understanding of the world today.
   ___It made me appreciate my own country more.
   ___It introduced me to new fields of reading interest.
   ___Others; please add any values of the course not listed above:
   ____
   ____.

5. Check any of the following possible changes that you feel would have made this course more valuable for you:

__If my high-school preparation for this course had been better.
___If it had included some history of Asia and Africa.
___If it had omitted African and Asian history and concentrated on Europe.
___If it had included some history of the Ancient world.
___If it had omitted Greek and Roman history and begun with the Middle Ages.
___If the time span covered by the course had been shorter.
___If the time span covered by the course had been longer.
___If there had been more lectures, less discussion.
___If there had been more discussion, less lecturing.
___If merely recent history had been covered.
___If more audio-visual materials had been used.
___If a better textbook had been selected.
___If lectures had been better organized and more interpretive.
___If some topics or eras had been explored in depth, rather than a survey of the entire sweep of the past.
___If there had been a broader coverage of the past, rather than devoting so much time to certain topics and eras.
___If the course could have been taken at the junior-senior level instead.
___The course didn't need any improvement.

6. Please indicate the grade which you received in this course at the close of the first semester or quarter: A___; B___; C___; D___; E (or failure)___; I (or Incomplete)___; W (or Withdrawal). Indicate the grade which you received at the close of the second semester or quarter: A___; B___; C___; D___; E___; I___; W___.

7. Please write below, or on the back of this sheet, any other impressions you recall of this course, or how you think it could be improved.

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 6

[This is intended for a sampling of alumni in the teaching profession who took the history of civilization course while enrolled at the 80 institutions selected for study in depth. A covering letter should accompany this questionnaire.]

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on the back of these sheets, identifying them with the item number.

1. From what institution did you receive your degree?________________.

2. What degree did you receive?_____In what year was it awarded?_______.

3. Are you now teaching in: elementary school___; junior high school___; senior high school___; junior college___; college or university___?

4. What was your undergraduate major?_______________minor?__________.

5. What was the name of the first history course you took in college?
___________________________________.

6. Did it include any materials on the non-Western world (Africa or Asia)? Yes___; No___.

7. As you remember this course, would you consider it:
   a very valuable course___; rather valuable___; average___; of little or no value___?
   very well taught___; rather well taught___; average___; poorly taught___?
   enjoyable___; rather interesting___; tolerable___; I disliked it___.

8. Check any of the following with which you would agree:
   ___I had to memorize many names and dates which have since faded from memory.
   ___I've disliked history ever since.
   ___The course made me like history.
   ___With the past explained in this course, I came to understand the present better.
   ___It helped me understand how historians make conclusions.
   ___It gave me a better sense of time, knowing when events in the past took place.
   ___Through this course I felt in better contact with other subjects.
   ___It provided an understanding of why society and culture change.
   ___It helped me learn to think rationally.
   ___The course gave me a greater interest in and understanding of the world today.
   ___It introduced me to new fields of reading interest.
   ___Others; please add any values of the course not listed above:
   ____
   ____.

9. Check any of the following possible changes that you feel would

improve the course:

___Addition of Afro-Asian history.
___Omission of Afro-Asian history and concentration on Europe.
___Inclusion of the Ancient world.
___Omission of Greek and Roman history in order to begin the course with the Middle Ages.
___A shorter time span should be covered.
___A longer time span should be covered.
___More lectures, less discussion in the course.
___More discussion, less lecturing.
___Only recent history should be covered.
___More audio-visual materials should be used.
___A better textbook should be selected.
___Lectures should be better organized, more interpretive.
___Important topics or eras should be explored in depth, rather than attempting to survey the entire sweep of the past.
___There should be a broader coverage of the past, rather than devoting so much time to certain topics and eras.
___The course should be taken at the junior-senior level, rather than the freshman-sophomore level.
___Better high-school preparation of students for this course is necessary.
___The course, as I recall it, was a good one, requiring no significant improvement.

10. If you think an introductory course in history different from the one you took would be preferable, indicate which of the following would be a superior substitute:

___History of Western civilization
___History of World civilizations
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___European history since c. 400 A.D.
___European history since c.1500 A.D.
___Other (please specify:)______________________________
___Asian history
___Latin American history
___U.S. or American history
___A choice of several of the above, at the student's option.

11. Do you think the course you took should be required for the bachelor's degree? Yes___; No___. If not, do you think it should be one of two or more options which the student would have in meeting a degree requirement? Yes___; No___.

12. Please write below, or on the back of this sheet, any other impressions you recall of this course, or how you think it could be improved.

Your name:_________________________
Address:____
Date:_______________________________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 7

[This is intended for a sampling of non-teaching alumni who took the history of civilization course while enrolled at the 80 institutions selected for study in depth. A covering letter should accompany this questionnaire.]
Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on the back of these sheets, identifying them with item numbers.

1. From what institution did you receive your bachelor's degree?_____ ________________________________. Was it a B.A.___ or B.S._____? In what year was it awarded?____________.

2. What is your present occupation?_________________________________.

3. What was your undergraduate major?____________minor?____________.

4. If you recall it, what was the name of the first history survey course you took in college?________________________________.

5. As you remember this course, would you consider it:
   a very valuable course___; rather valuable___; average___; of little or no value___?
   very well taught___; rather well taught___; average___; poorly taught___?
   enjoyable___; rather interesting___; tolerable___; I disliked it___.

6. Check any of the following with which you would agree:
   ___I had to memorize many names and dates which have since faded from memory.
   ___I've disliked history ever since.
   ___The course made me like history.
   ___With the past explained in this course, I came to understand the present better.
   ___It helped me understand how historians make conclusions.
   ___It gave me a better sense of time, knowing when events in the past took place.
   ___Through this course I felt in better contact with other subjects.
   ___It provided an understanding of why society and culture change.
   ___It helped me learn to think rationally.
   ___The course gave me a greater interest in and understanding of the world today.
   ___It introduced me to new fields of reading interest.
   ___Others; please add any values of the course not listed above:
   ____
   ____.

9. Check any of the following possible changes that you feel would improve the course:
   ___Addition of Afro-Asian history.
   ___Omission of Afro-Asian history and concentration on Europe.
   ___Inclusion of the Ancient world.
   ___Omission of Greek and Roman history in order to begin the course with the Middle Ages.

___A shorter time span should be covered.
___A longer time span should be covered.
___More lectures, less discussion in the course.
___More discussion, less lecturing.
___Only recent history should be covered.
___More audio-visual materials should be used.
___A better textbook should be selected.
___Lectures should be better organized, more interpretive.
___Important topics or eras should be explored in depth, rather than attempting to survey the entire sweep of the past.
___There should be a broader coverage of the past, rather than devoting so much time to certain topics and eras.
___The course should be taken at the junior-senior level, rather than at the freshman-sophomore level.
___Better high-school preparation of students for this course is necessary.
___The course, as I recall it, was a good one, requiring no significant change or improvement.

10. If you think an introductory course in history different from the one you took would be preferable, indicate which of the following would be a superior substitute:

___History of Western civilization
___History of World civilizations
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___European history since c. 400 A.D.
___European history since c.1500 A.D.
___Asian history
___Latin American history
___U.S. or American history
___A choice of several of the above, at the student's option.
___Other (please specify:)________________________________

11. Please write below, or on the back of this sheet, any other impressions you recall of this course, or how you think it could be improved.

Your name:____________________________
Address:____
Date:________________________________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 8

/This is intended for the chairman of the department of history at each university in the United States which offers the Ph.D. degree in history. A covering letter should accompany this questionnaire./

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number.

Institution:___________________________City:______________State:_____.

1. Approximately how long has your university been granting the Ph.D. in history? Less than 5 years___; 5 to 10 years___; 11 to 30 years ___; over 30 years___.

2. Please estimate the proportion of those who earn the Ph.D. in history at your institution who:
   gain some teaching experience as graduate assistants: 0-10%___; 11-20%; 21-30%___; 31-40%___; 41-50%___; over 50%___.
   accept a position in some other institution prior to receiving the doctorate: 0-10%___; 11-20%___; 21-30%___; 31-40%___; 41-50% ___; over 50%___.
   are expected to teach a course in the history of civilization at the institution where they receive their first appointment: 0-10%___; 11-20%___; 21-30%___; 31-40%___; 41-50%___; over 50%___.

3. If a large number of your graduates are expected to teach the history of civilization course, is it your impression that they regard this as a necessary burden, a kind of "purgatory" through which they must pass in order to teach their specialty? Yes, in most cases___; in some cases___; not in many cases____.

4. Are graduate assistants involved in teaching the introductory undergraduate history survey course at your institution? Yes___; No___. If yes, do they give lectures? Yes___; No___. Do they conduct discussion sections? Yes___; No___. Or are they limited to grading papers? Yes___; No___.

5. Is there anything in your graduate program in history especially designed to equip your graduates to teach the civilization course? Yes___; No___. If yes, please indicate what this is:______________
   ____
   ____
   ____.

6. Does your graduate program include any courses, seminars, or other activities which provide the student instruction, guidance, or assistance in instructional methods? Yes___; No___. If yes, please describe these:____
   ____
   ____.

7. In which of the following areas do you think your graduates might be deficient in their preparation to teach history of civilization courses:

___political science
___economics
___sociology
___intellectual history
___philosophy and religion
___the fine arts
___language and literature
___science and technology
___anthropology
___psychology

___history of the non-Western world
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___Renaissance and Reformation
___Modern Europe

___pedagogy
___Others(please specify:)______
____
____

8. Please indicate below or on the opposite side of this sheet whether you think graduate schools offering the Ph.D. degree in history should modify their programs in any way to better prepare their graduates to teach the history of civilization course, and if so, how.

Your name:______________________________ Date:______________

Thank you very much!

QUESTIONNAIRE HCP 9

[This is intended for the chairman of the department of history at selected institutions which do not offer a history of civilization course, and, if such an official exists, for the director of general, basic, or liberal studies at the same institutions. A covering letter should accompany this questionnaire.]

Please check or write in the appropriate answers, as indicated. If space is insufficient, kindly enter any further comments you wish to make on a separate sheet, identifying them with the item number.

Institution:______________________________City:____________State:_______

1. What is the name of the introductory course in history at your institution, the one students usually take before enrolling in more advanced history courses?____.
   What, briefly, does this course cover?____________________________
   ____.

2. For approximately how many years has this been the introductory course? 1 to 3 years___; 4 to 6 years___; 7 to 10 years___; longer than 10 years___.

3. Prior to the time the present introductory course was established, what was the previous introductory course in history, and what, briefly did it cover?____
   ____
   ____.

4. A substantial majority of colleges and universities in the United States offer a course in the history of civilization as the introductory offering in history, as you are aware. Please indicate if your institution's preference for a different introductory course is attributable to any of the following criticisms sometimes levelled against the civilization course. If so, which did you consider the most significant strictures ?
   ___The scope is too broad. The scope is too narrow___.
   ___There are too many details for the student to absorb.
   ___The course lacks depth.
   ___The textbooks are inadequate.
   ___Instructors are too much wedded to a specialized field.
   ___Students have inadequate high-school preparation for the course.
   ___The course is just a rehash for students, who have had excellent high-school preparation.
   ___The history department in general opposes such a course.
   ___The general, basic, or liberal studies division favors a course different from history of civilization.
   ___The student has no opportunity to learn historical method or to develop a critical sense in such a course.
   ___Others (please specify:)_______________________________________
   ____
   ____
   ____

(The values and advantages of history of civilization courses were discussed on a prior questionnaire /HCP 1/ which you were kind enough to complete some time ago, so these merits need not be taken up here.)

5. Has a course in the history of Western or World civilization ever been offered as the introductory course in history at your institution and abandoned? Yes___; No___. If yes, why was the change introduced?____
____
____.

6. Please characterize the general attitude of your staff toward the present introductory course: Enthusiastic___; Well satisfied___; So-so___; Critical___; Very critical___.

7. If it is possible to estimate, approximately what fraction of your staff would prefer a civilization course as the introductory offering? One-fifth___; two-fifths___; three-fifths___; four-fifths___.

8. Which of the following do you think should be the basic course in history, the one that more college freshmen take than any other single history course, whether it is required or not? A one-year course is assumed.

___History of Western civilization
___History of World civilizations
___Ancient history
___Medieval history
___European history since c. 400 A.D.
___Modern European history since c. 1500 A.D.
___Other (please specify:)_______________________________
____.

___Asian history
___Latin American history
___U.S. or American history
___A choice of several of the above, at the student's option.

9. Please use this space for concluding comments of any kind, or for an overall assessment:

Your name:_______________________ Title:______________
Date:_______________

Thank you very much!